

Durham E-Theses

The concept of the EIO 'ANHP in the Greco-Roman world with special reference to the first two centuries A.D.

Elwyn Jones

How to cite:

Jones, Elwyn (1973) The concept of the EIO 'ANHP in the Greco-Roman world with special reference to the first two centuries A.D. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7937/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The origin of the concept of "godlike man" in Graeco-Roman civilization may be traced back to mythological accounts of sons of gods. Later the shaman-like figures of archaic Greece possess an other-worldliness which was clearly perceptible in an age of superstition and intense religiosity. Earliest representatives of the type for which sufficiently detailed evidence can be pieced together are Pythagoras and Empedocles. Socrates, whose enigmatic life has to be seen against the background of a more rational age, also possessed a "daemonic" personality.

A variation of the concept occurs in ruler-cult. Alexander the Great, who emulated demi-gods, was worshipped by virtue of his own omnipotence. His controversial personality was open to the double interpretation of megalomania and the pursuit of a divine mission. There was little religious significance in the worship of later rulers except possibly for Augustus. The divine king is discussed in philosophical thought from Xenophon and Plato down to the Stoics and Cynics of the imperial age.

But it is in the light of the revival of religious Pythagorism that the later category, as portrayed by Philostratus, may best be viewed. Hence the thesis is chiefly concerned with Apollonius of Tyana and the literary and historical context of the age in which both he and his biographer lived. Striking parallels are afforded by Lucian, and a similar literary category may be seen in Jewish and popular Christian writings. A detailed study of the Graeco-Roman concept, it is hoped, may provide a background for current Christological discussion as well as throw light on the history of religious ideas in the ancient world.

THE CONCEPT OF THE $\Theta\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ 'ANHP IN THE GRAECO-ROMAN
WORLD WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES A.D.

ELWYN JONES

PH.D. THESIS

1973

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

Is it so bad, then, to be misunderstood?
Pythagoras was misunderstood, and Socrates, and
Jesus, and Luther, and Copernicus, and Galileo,
and Newton, and every pure and wise spirit that
ever took flesh. To be great is to be mis-
understood.

R. W. Emerson (1803-1882)
Essays, ii. Self-Reliance

PREFACE

It is often asserted that the researcher in the humanities can hope to do one of two things: he can travel unattended along a sequestered path in pursuit of knowledge hitherto but dimly known to others, or he can follow a distinguished company of scholars along the crowded highways of his own particular branch of learning and seek to provide a fresh interpretation or a new approach to a perhaps well-loved and much-studied theme. It is the aim of this work to combine the two processes in an analysis and interpretation of the classical concept of the *θεος ἄνθρωπος*. Some of the personalities discussed may well be obscure and seldom brought under review. But the religious or charismatic life is a universally attested ideal with parallels extending from the Graeco-Roman *θεος ἄνθρωπος* to the twentieth-century holy man of Tibet.

A concept so far-reaching, however, requires a rigid delimitation of its scope. I have confined the main discussion to the Graeco-Roman world down to the beginning of the third century A.D. The often arbitrary distinction between classical and Christian studies as two separate areas of investigation has for the purposes of this thesis been removed. Christian and Jewish communities of the first two centuries A.D., while preserving their individual identities on the periphery of the Empire, could not avoid sharing to some extent the common intellectual developments, if not perhaps the moral culture, of the Romanized world. It is hoped that this study will shed light on parallel religious ideas which came to a head in the important centuries when Christianity was beginning to assert its influence in the world. Moreover, the biographies of Graeco-Roman *θεοὶ ἄνθρωποι* were antecedents to the hagiographic literature of the Middle Ages. And today the modern saint or godlike man, though often a political rather than a religious champion, is no less real an object of worship for his followers. A detailed examination of the ancient prototype may contribute to a wider understanding of this long-lived conception of men as gods.

However obscure one's theme, it is virtually impossible not to build one's material and views upon the scholarship of others. Few would choose positively not to do so. My indebtedness to writers past and present will appear in the footnotes and their publications are listed in the bibliography. A more personal debt I must gratefully acknowledge to Professors J. B. Skemp and C. K. Barrett of the University of Durham. Professor Barrett suggested the work in the first place and always maintained an active interest in its progress. Professor Skemp encouraged, directed and bore with every stage of the research. Both enriched it with scholarly acumen, patient criticism and kind advice. Many of their suggestions formed a major contribution to the scope of this thesis, though I must take full responsibility for the conclusions and for all errors of fact or judgement that they may contain.

On the subject of ruler-cult I was supplied with bibliographic information together with many useful suggestions by Mr. R. P. Wright and Dr. P. J. Rhodes. Drs. K. Werner and R. W. J. Austin talked to me about Indian and Islamic parallels.

After two years' full-time research in Durham I was appointed to a Temporary Lectureship in Classics at the University of Keele (1970-71). It is no understatement that my work would not have been completed even at this late stage without the generosity and sympathy of Professor J. M. T. Charlton. To him and to former colleagues at Keele my grateful thanks are due for the full consideration of my needs in the planning of a year's teaching programme, and in particular to Mr. G. B. Nussbaum for his friendship and his willingness to discuss and tirelessly listen to various aspects of the thesis.

Finally I wish to thank Miss A. Pearson for typing the manuscript with great alacrity and efficiency, my wife for cheerfully enduring many long periods of solitude, and my mother and father, for whom no words of gratitude will suffice and to whom I dedicate this imperfect offering.

E. J.

Batley,
March, 1973.

CONTENTS

	page
Preface	iv
Introductory Note	1
PART ONE: GOD-MAN IN EARLIER GRAECO-ROMAN LITERATURE	
I	9
Divine Identification for Exceptional Human Beings	
Mythology	9
Psychic personalities in archaic age	13
Empedocles of Acragas	18
II	25
Pythagorean and Socratic Traditions: A Comparison in Source Criticism	
Difficulties with sources for Pythagoras	26
Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος in Pythagorean legend	28
Problem of Socrates and history of legend	44
Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος in Socratic tradition	47
III	56
Divine Honours for Conquerors and Kings	
Alexander the Great	57
Hellenistic Kings	66
Roman Emperors	73
IV	83
Divine Man and Divine King in Philosophical Thought	
Statesman and King	83
Wise Man	91
Divine spark in every man	94
PART TWO: GOD-MAN IN LATER GRAECO-ROMAN LITERATURE	
V	100
Philostratus (1) Portrait of a Divine Man	
Claim and recognition	100
Superhuman powers and knowledge	106
Close relationship with god	115
Contributory features	121

		page
VI	Philostratus (II) Sources for the Historical Apollonius	127
	Traditions other than Philostratus	127
	Sources of Philostratus	139
	The historicity of Apollonius	158
VII	Philostratus (III) Motivation and Interpretation	167
	Rhetoric and ostentation	167
	Romantic elements	170
	Political aspects	175
	Apologetic: the charge of sorcery	181
	Pythagorism	191
	Polemic against Christianity	197
VIII	Near and Later Contemporaries of Philostratus	206
	Lucian	207
	Philo and Josephus	225
	The later biographical tradition	235
IX	Early Christian Literature	239
	New Testament Apocrypha	240
	Canonical New Testament	254
	Christology and the Hellenistic divine man	262
	Conclusion	277
	Appendixes	
	1. The Collection of Apollonius's Letters	286
	2. The Authenticity of Damis	290
	3. A Probable Chronology for Apollonius	295
	4. Rhetoric and Ostentation in Philostratus	297
	Bibliography	300
	Indexes	
	A. Index of Proper Names	309
	B. Index (selected) of Subjects	313

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The charismatic leader or reformer operates in political, religious, social or other spheres.¹ His superhuman proportions are sometimes clear to all men; more frequently they are discernible only to his devoted followers. When, however, he is the prophet of a religious way of life, the qualities of the charismatic man are understood all the more in terms of a divine or godlike nature. It is the god-man in a religious sense that will form the main theme of this thesis.

Even so, examples of this category of men may be cited from every age and from all parts of the world. In the archaic age of Greece many so-called shamanistic figures were believed to possess superhuman knowledge and power. And various generations of Greeks or Romans worshipped, among others, Pythagoras, Empedocles, Socrates and, much later, Apollonius of Tyana. The term so often used to describe such a man was θεῖος ἀνὴρ /divinus vir. In the early Church popular worship of the apostles and saints either was not or could not entirely be suppressed. The Jews revered Moses, Elijah and other "men of God". Buddhists looked for the nibbuta-man or the bodhisattva, Moslems awaited their mahdis or "perfected men" and Hindus their avatars.²

It is inevitable that with a concept so long-lasting and so

¹With Christ, Buddha and Mohammed in the religious sphere we should certainly compare modern political revolutionaries like Mao Tse-tung, Che Guevara and even Adolph Hitler. Moreover, the better known among the idols of the entertainment world today enjoy little short of a cult in the full sense of the word.

²Cf. T. Ling, History of Religion East and West (London, 1968), Mohammed and Buddha were prophets of their religion and as such were entitled to worship as god-men along with others. The New Testament conception of Jesus, however, is quite unique. He is not simply prophet or founder of religion (i.e. at least θεῖος ἀνὴρ) but much more besides, as himself the One God.

widespread as that of god-man certain modifications may be seen as it re-emerges, often independently, in different ages or societies. The Graeco-Roman *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, for example, may differ hardly at all from the mediaeval Christian saint in respect of the way of life and superhuman power common to both. Yet in the Dark Ages the same categories are evident in the legends told about the great magicians of Europe, Merlin, Theophilus, Gerbert (Silvester II) and Roger Bacon.¹ In the sixteenth century John Dee, the Elizabethan astrologer, claimed to have talked with ghosts and angels;² and the infamous Dr. Faust in Germany became the subject of a legion of legends. Europe of the eighteenth century witnessed the extraordinary lives of Cagliostro and the mysterious Comte de St. Germain, both of whom were variously regarded as charlatans and wielders of genuine psychic power.³ In the next century Eliphas Levi, the French occultist, is said to have evoked the spirit of Apollonius of Tyana at London (1854).

On the other hand, a more authentic class of modern god-men—i.e. *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* rather than *μάγος καὶ γόης*—was represented by the Curé of Ars (1786-1859) who in addition to possessing powers of telepathy claimed to have been haunted by devils (like St. Antony in the desert). Mirza Ali Mohammed, founder of the Bahai movement in Persia (d. 1850), declared himself to be a manifestation of god on earth and predicted that an even greater manifestation would soon appear, namely Baha-Ullah (Splendour of God), who in 1863 was revealed to be Mirza Hussain Ali. The Bahais in fact believe that their prophet was the most recent in a line of manifestations from Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus and Mohammed. The Indian holy men Ramakrishna (1836-1886) and Sai Baba (1855-1918) were recognized by many as avatars. Moreover, Haranath (1865-1927), who displayed powers of clairvoyance and psychic healing, was said to have "died" for ten hours in 1896 while his soul communed with the Divine Being.⁴

¹Cf. E. M. Butler, The Myth of the Magus (Cambridge, 1948). Perhaps Simon Magus was the archetype of the sorcerer.

²Swedenborg (1688-1772) claimed inspiration from God and angels, and, whatever the true nature of his writings, he did not lack the temperament of a mystic.

³The Comte de St. Germain together with Apollonius of Tyana was adopted by the late-nineteenth-century Theosophists as one of their "Masters". On these see E. M. Butler, op. cit.

⁴For the holy men in this paragraph see the articles s.v. in Man Myth and Magic, an illustrated encyclopaedia published originally in 112 weekly parts by Purnell (1969-71).

Today the Dalai Lama is worshipped as a god in Tibet, and many authoritative teachers from India can attract a vast following of devoted disciples. In 1972 the fourteen-year-old Guru Maharaj Ji was acclaimed Lord of the Universe by the Divine Light Mission in London.¹

Besides European magi and holy men of the East, another kind of god-man has been revealed by recent anthropological studies of indigenous peoples all over the world. This is the shaman or medicine-man found among the aborigines of Africa, Australia, Brazil, North America, Canada, Lapland and the Pacific islands.² He would be responsible for the religious affairs of the community, for communicating with the supernatural, for divination, for healing the sick and for protecting his own people against the black magic of other medicine-men.

In the Graeco-Roman world, however, as will be seen later, the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* often had a double reputation as divine or diabolic according to the natural bent of writers. Yet it is possible that the diametrically opposed views on men like Apollonius or Peregrinus may be due to the multiple personality complex within a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. Maybe it was no less feasible for Alexander of Abonuteichos to possess the qualities of visionary and fraud than for Rasputin, the Russian starets or man of God (1871-1916), to appear both fiendish and saintlike to his contemporaries. Indeed the popular title "Holy Devil" for Rasputin aptly reflects by its antithesis the apparent ambiguity in the lives of the ancient *θεῖου ἄνδρες*.³

However, even if this study is restricted, as it must be, to the Graeco-Roman world, the conception of god-man for that civilisation is far from uniform. Epic heroes in oral and literary versions of saga are always supermen, as is the hero (or heroine) in the folklore and literature of all cultures. With the superhuman effort and achievement of Theseus and Heracles one may compare in Western

¹For Apollonius of Tyana his journeys to India were said to have been of critical importance. See below, p. 194, cf. 185f.

²See Mircea Eliade, Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy (London, 1967).

³Rasputin had learnt from the Khlysty sect powers of prophecy, healing by prayer, and exorcism. He was believed to have cured of haemophilia Alexis, son of Tsar Nicholas II.

Europe that of Beowulf, Arthur, Siegfried and the Charlemagne of legend, and in the New World that of Haiawatha and Davy Crockett.¹ Although this work is limited in its scope to the examination of the superman as a religious concept, it would still need to include heroes like Heracles and Aeneas, whose lives were conceived in the eyes of later generations as following divine guidance in the pursuit of an ordained mission. But these are literary interpretations, the one of Cynicism and the other of Roman nationalism, and they cannot be read too far back. There is, of course, also little factual basis for the "heroic" superman. Except, therefore, where non-historical heroes help to shed light on the later concept of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, they will not form any significant part of this discussion.²

Again, the god-man occurs in a non-religious sphere but concerning historical personalities in the phenomenon of ruler-cult. Much of the substance of ruler-cult is irrelevant to this thesis. But it is not always certain whether some rulers were worshipped on political and economic or on religious and devotional grounds. The disposition of the rulers is also important in this respect.

Veneration of the sage in philosophical thought is almost entirely a mental attitude and bears little resemblance to popular religious devotion. Nevertheless, the *divinus vir* of Stoicism, though not identical with, is a parallel concept to the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* of the Pythagorists and will have to be examined. Moreover, it will be important to notice philosophical speculation concerning an ideal monarch (if one could be found) as superhuman being.

¹On the myth of the hero (an altogether different subject) see J. Campbell, The Hero with a Thousand Faces (2nd ed. Princeton, 1968); C. M. Bowra, Heroic Poetry (London, 1952). In its simplest form this represents the forces of Good against Evil, whether personified in Robin Hood and the Sheriff of Nottingham, the detective and the criminal, or the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* and the tyrant. Nietzsche's vision of the Übermensch may indicate only a more exalted version of this myth (in Also Sprach Zarathustra - 1881).

²On Heracles see R. Hoistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King (Uppsala, 1948) and on Aeneas as *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* see Brooks Otis, Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry (Oxford, 1964), where enough has been said.

Different again are stories full of wonder about Olympian gods who temporarily assume human form in order to visit mankind, as, for example, in Ovid's account of Baucis and Philemon (Met. 8. 618 ff.) and in Euripides' Bacchae.

In the general survey of Part One an attempt will be made to trace the growth and development of a concept of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* in the earlier Graeco-Roman world and before Philostratus's Life of Apollonius. The term will be viewed in its widest application with reference to legendary, literary, philosophical and political as well as genuinely religious conceptions of god-man. In Part Two the narrower usage will be taken up as it applies to the few historical personalities who in a theological sense were considered to be of godlike origin and whose lives in their entirety could not be explained without recourse to divine attributes. Such men may be supremely wise, supremely strong and supremely influential; but above all, they must be supremely "holy". They will appear to have been appointed by god to deliver some message to mankind or perform some task in the world, and while they are not themselves gods but live on earth like other men, yet they would seem to belong also to some other mysterious plane of existence whereby they wield undefinable but effective power or mana.

Such a figure will be acceptable only in an age of great religiosity. The shamanistic seers of the archaic age and, after them, Pythagoras and Empedocles (both of whom operated in comparatively remote or primitive areas of the Graeco-Roman world) fall into this category. In the classical Greek period Socrates is the only authentic predecessor of the type which later was to be very common in the age of latter-day superstition and religious fervour, namely the early centuries of the Empire. The glut of god-men whom Celsus refers to in his attack on Christianity (Origen c. Celsum 7.8f.) are vividly mirrored in the literature of that period: Lucian discharged some of his most virulent abuse on Peregrinus and Alexander; Philostratus composed an extremely pious and laudatory account of the wondrous life of Apollonius, as did Porphyry and Iamblichus for Pythagoras.

And now a word of explanation about the Jewish and Christian material discussed in Part Two. It will be an essential tenet of this thesis that the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* was not suddenly invented by any one writer--though Philostratus would seem to have used it more extensively than most others--but that it evolved gradually through the centuries, at first being understood more through oral tradition than in any written form, until in the first two centuries A.D. it was utilized more freely by writers of many nationalities and creeds

in order to depict more forcibly various exponents of authoritative teachings from different cultural backgrounds. Philo and Josephus, though Jews, lived in a Hellenized and Romanized world. They used with natural ease the same modes of expression, the same language as Philostratus and Lucian. Early Christian writers, even when they were not addressing themselves specifically to the unconverted, could not avoid some of the influences and ideas of the society and culture as well as the language of the Graeco-Roman world to which they belonged. This, of course, does not mean that there were not also major differences between the Jewish, Christian and Hellenistic *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. These will be brought out in the text.

Finally, it may be appropriate to comment briefly on the linguistic usage of the word *θεῖος /divinus*. A general and strict employment of this and synonymous terms may be distinguished, the former bearing a secular and the latter a theological meaning.¹

Homer, Pindar and the Tragedians use the word *θεῖος* frequently of heroes, who were in any case "sprung from gods". But the epithet in *θεῖος Ὀδυσσεύς* (Il. 2.335), *θείων βασιλῶν* (Od. 4.691), *φῆρ . . . θεῖος* (Pind. Pyth. 4.119, of Chiron), *θεῖος Ὀρέστης* (Aesch. Choeph. 867) and others like them is probably a stock formula which has lost any precise meaning it may originally have had.² A good translation may be excellent, magnificent, a well attested meaning in Homer with inanimate objects, e.g. *θεῖον ποτόν* (Od. 2.341). Again, when it is used of historical figures, *θεῖος* sometimes carries little religious significance, denoting no more than excellence in one special quality as, for example, the inspiration felt by the best poets and speakers. The Homeric *θεῖος Ζαῖδός* (Od. 4.17) or *θεῖος κῆρυξ* (Il. 4.192) is thus recalled by Plato's description of the poet Simonides as *σόφος καὶ θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* (Resp. 1.331e), Cicero's description of Sophocles as poeta divinus (Div. 1.53) and

¹ Compare in English Isaac Watts' "Love so amazing, so Divine" (Hymn When I survey the wondrous cross) with Shakespeare's "Divinest creature... how shall I honour thee for this success" (Henry VI 1.6, 4).

² Cf. *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* as used in Aesch. Ag. 1548 (Agamemnon), Soph. Philoct. 726 (Heracles), Pind. Pyth. 6.38 (Antilochus), and Philostr. VA 4.13 (Palamedes). Cf. also the "heroic" description of Xerxes as *ἰσόθεος φῶς* (Aesch. Pers. 80).

Dio Chrysostom's expression *θεῖος Ὀμηρος* (Or. 2.11 and 18). All refer to the capacity of these men as inspired poets and to no other quality or characteristic.

Eventually the term or its equivalent was used of the inspired philosopher. In some instances, like Cicero's reference to Aristotle's *ingenium praedivinum* (Div. 1.53), this may be simply exaggerated praise. Similar, perhaps, was Seneca's high regard for Q. Sextius, the philosopher of the Augustan age: *cum legeris Sextium dices: ... supra hominem est* (Ep. 64.2). Lucretius calls Epicurus the *deus.../qui princeps vitae rationem eam quae/nunc appellatur sapientia* (5.8-10; cf. 19), whereas Cicero considers Plato to be *quasi quendam deum philosophorum* (Nat. D. 2.32; cf. Att. 4.16, 3; Tusc. 1.39). In the third century Porphyry described the true philosopher as a *θεῖος καὶ θεόσοφος ἀνὴρ* (De Abst. 2.45). But by this time the strong theological interpretation had begun to limit the meaning of *θεῖος*, and a fully developed life-pattern came to be expected for such a class of beings. Out of a formalistic epithet a new and meaningful (perhaps the original) concept had evolved. The term no longer referred to one isolated quality or peculiarity in a man; instead it was used to explain the whole course of his life.

There is, however, need for caution here. Not everyone who was called *θεῖος* or attributed one or two of the detached features which together form the complete *Bild* of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* will belong *ipso facto* to that category in the full theological sense of the words. Lucian's description of the external features of Pancrates (*Philopseudes* 34) is the only characteristic that connects him to the category. On the other hand, the whole lives of Peregrinus Proteus and Alexander of Abonuteichos may be viewed in terms of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. In the same way Philostratus does avail himself of isolated features to describe Heracles of Marathon and Alexander "Clay-Plato" (VS 2.1, 7; 2.5, 1), but only to Apollonius of Tyana is the whole category applied in any serious or extensive measure.¹

¹Detached features which undoubtedly belong to this category (supernatural birth, superhuman strength, divine protection, benevolent animals, etc.) are related by Pausanias about the Messenian hero Aristomenes (Paus. 4.14-24). But there is no evidence for a religious interpretation of his life. He belongs to the class of charismatic political revolutionaries.

The present study is concerned not so much with a general schematization of all the isolated features of the category or the construction of, so to speak, an "identikit" picture of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* from a wide and indiscriminate use of all available sources. Such a useful service has already been rendered by Ludwig Bieler, ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ, das Bild vom gottlichen Menschen in Spätantike und Frühchristentum (2 vols. Vienna, 1935/6, repr. in one vol. 1967), a book to which I am pleased to acknowledge a great debt not only for the encyclopaedic range of its examples under various headings for the schema of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* but also for the critical insight which its author brings to bear upon many questions arising out of his approach.¹ Yet there is a disadvantage in a composite portrait of this kind which deals only in generalities. That is to say, one ceases to discuss real individuals and one begins to think only in terms of formal stereotypes. It will be my purpose and method to consider specific *θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι* rather than their depersonalized type, to trace the evolution of the concept in the traditions on the lives of these individuals, and to look for signs of influence or parallel development in the course of the evolution of this concept.

¹Bieler's book is essential background reading for all students of ancient and mediaeval hagiography. His method is followed by H. D. Betz in Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament (Berlin, 1961).

PART ONE

GOD-MAN IN EARLIER GRAECO-ROMAN LITERATURE

CHAPTER I

DIVINE IDENTIFICATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL HUMAN BEINGS

Mythology

It has been demonstrated already that the conception of men as gods occurs in almost every part of the world and in every age. It is as complex a notion as it is widespread. The *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* may be a literary, philosophical, historical or mythological category. Although it remains the purpose of this thesis to examine in depth only the historical *θεῖοι ἄνδρες* of flesh and blood in the Graeco-Roman world, it need hardly be said that later concepts of deification will almost inevitably be influenced by earlier knowledge or beliefs about prehistoric or mythological god-men. Before therefore any historical *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* known to have existed in the Greek or Roman world can be discussed, it will be profitable perhaps to set forth (without going into many details) predecessors of the historical type in the legendary traditions from the past.

The world described by Homer and Hesiod contained its own hierarchy of Olympian gods, lesser deities (or demi-gods), heroes and men. From this world Heracles may be selected as the archetypal *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, the first mortal who attained divinity by virtue of his immense and often benevolent achievements on earth. According to the later legend, after his death he was received into the company of the Olympians, but only as a secondary god.¹ Belief in this apotheosis

¹Hom. *Od.* 11.602-04; Hes. *Theog.* 950-55; Pind. *Isthm.* 4.61ff. Hdt. 2.44; Ovid. *Met.* 9.241-73; Pausanias 3.18, 11. Cf. Aristoph. *Aves* 567, 1574ff.

came certainly after Homer, but it must have been before the composition of Hesiod's Theogony.¹ Divine and heroic honours were attested for Heracles at various places in the Greek world.²

Another mythological *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* will be Asclepius, who, though in Rome always a god, was in the Greek world originally a hero, son of Apollo and the mortal woman, Coronis.³ After learning from Chiron the art of healing, Asclepius devised a method of raising the dead and thus caused no slight offence to Hades, who envisaged the gradual depopulation of his realm. Zeus intervened by destroying him with a thunderbolt. But later tradition has him restored to life and finally raised to the stars.⁴ The fourth-century temple at Epidaurus speaks adequately of his cult, whether or not it was originally a divine or heroic sanctuary.⁵ Eventually there were shrines throughout the Mediterranean.

Dionysus, son of Zeus and Semele, seems to have been a god from the start. He was reared, however, not in heaven but by nymphs and satyrs, and he spent a long period on earth among mankind, where as a new god he needed to travel far and wide in order to promote the acceptance of his cult. This was established universally only after a considerable opposition in many places, and Dionysus was finally deemed worthy of the company of the Olympian gods in heaven. According to Apollodorus (3.5,3), in order to preserve the number of twelve Hestia surrendered her place.

¹See reference in previous note. Homer (Il. 18. 177ff.) gives the earlier view that not even Heracles could escape death. The passage in Od. 11. 602ff. is ascribed by one scholiast to Onomacritus, one of the reputed compilers of the Homeric poems under the Pisistratids (Schol. Harl. Od. 11.604).

²Pausanias 2.10, 1; 7.5, 3; 9.27, 5; Strabo 13.1, 64; Diod. Sic. 4.39. Herodotus (2.44) refers to a double cult of Heracles as Olympian god and hero with two separate temples. Cf. the apt title *ἥρωσ θεός* in Pind. Nem. 3.22. See also L. R. Farnell, Greek Hero Cults (Oxford, 1921), pp. 95ff.; W. K. C. Guthrie, The Greeks and their Gods (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 231ff.; R. Graves, The Greek Myths (2 vols. Penguin, 1957) II pp. 200-06 (No. 145).

³Hom. Il. 2.729; 4.194; Pind. Pyth. 3 passim.

⁴This was later than the tradition for Heracles as a god. Cf. Ovid. Met. 15.642ff.; Germanicus Aratea 77ff.; Hyginus Poet. Astr. 2.14. See also R. Graves, op. cit., I pp. 175-76 (No. 50 g and n. 8).

⁵Pausanias (2.26, 7) says he finds evidence of belief in Asclepius as a god from early times. See also L. R. Farnell, op. cit., pp. 234ff.; W. K. C. Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 242ff.

Dionysus, Heracles and Asclepius all have identical parentage. Yet Dionysus is the only one of the twelve Olympians said to have been born of a mortal woman. Neither of the other two is accorded that status. This may seem surprising when it is considered that life on earth was for Heracles no less than for Dionysus a divine struggle in which the son of god must prove himself worthy of his divine parentage. Both made at different times the humanly impossible descent to the underworld, and both returned in safety. They are commonly mentioned together by ancient writers.¹ Again, just as Asclepius received instruction from Chiron Dionysus served an initiatory period under Silenus. Perhaps as less foreign to the Greek world Asclepius and Heracles were attributed stronger human characteristics appropriate to Greek sons of gods, whereas Dionysus, the older god imported from Thrace or elsewhere, became more human only after men saw fit to compare him with Alexander the Great as a globe-trotting bringer of peace and civilization.² In Euripides' Bacchae Dionysus explicitly claims to be a god in the form of a man so that the audience at least are not left in doubt until the end whether the human or divine nature is uppermost.³ However, in the late epic poem of Nonnus (? 5th century A.D.) it is often hard to decide whether Dionysus is god, demi-god, or hero. He is assigned all the features which are appropriate to the later category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, the being half-way between god and man.⁴

Trophonius and Amphiaraus, who are generally classed as chthonian deities,⁵ provide further examples of primitive precedents for the historical conception of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Trophonius was worshipped

¹L. Bieler, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ*, II p. 118. Cf. Philostr. VA 2.33; Strabo 3.171; Diod. Sic. 17.95; Plut. De Alex. fort. 332b.

²L. Bieler, op. cit., II p. 118.

³Eur. Bacch. 1ff. For the priest as a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* in this play see L. Bieler's discussion, op. cit., II pp. 47ff.

⁴L. Bieler, op. cit., II p. 70.

⁵See W. K. C. Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 223ff.; L. R. Farnell, op. cit., pp. 21ff., 58ff., 405 n. 25, 406 n. 31.

as a god at Lebadea, where his oracle was famous;¹ Amphiaraus presided over an oracular shrine at Oropus.² It is highly probable that both were originally local gods; and as Greek religion became more systematized, later legend required them to become heroes. The reverse is extremely unlikely, that is for divine status to be conferred as an afterthought on those who were initially the sons of heroes.³ Both were swallowed up by the earth and so can claim never to have died.⁴

Other heroes such as Orpheus or Achilles, the sons of human fathers and less important goddesses, are never considered gods in the traditional legends. Achilles' ghost appears to Odysseus in Hades along with the other kings of the Achaeans.⁵ Orpheus while on earth was, of course, a musician of superhuman skill and can claim to have journeyed to Hades and back again in safety. Different accounts of his death exist, but it is certain that he did die.⁶ Theseus, along with Pirithous, made a catabasis. But not without the help of Heracles did he return, if he returned at all.⁷ He died and was honoured by the Athenians only as a demi-god.⁸

¹Pausanias 1.34, 2; Philostr. VA 8.19.

²Pausanias 1.34, 2-3; Strabo 9.2, 10.

³Trophonius was son of Erginus, an Argonaut. Amphiaraus's father was Decles (Aesch. Sept. 609 and elsewhere) or possibly Apollo (Hyginus Fab. 70).

⁴Pausanias 9.37, 3 (Trophonius--cf. Hdt. 2.121) and 1.34, 2 (Amphiaraus). In a different legend Trophonius and his brother Agamedes, after building Apollo's threshold at Delphi are rewarded with a simultaneous gentle death (? Plut. Consol. ad Apoll. 14).

⁵Hom. Od. 11.467ff. For hero-worship of Achilles see Plut. Pyrrhus 1; Strabo 13.1, 32; Cic. Nat. D. 3.45.

⁶Ovid. Met. 11.1-85; Pausanias 9.30, 3ff.

⁷For the tradition that Theseus was detained in Hades see Verg. Aen. 6.617-18 and possibly Hom. Od. 11.631. On this catabasis in general see R. Graves, op. cit., I p. 362 (No. 103).

⁸Pausanias 1.17, 6; Plut. Cimon 11, Theseus 36.

The deification of Romulus and Aeneas is clearly a borrowing from the Greeks and the evidence for it belongs only to the Roman world. Cf. Plut. Rom. 28; Dion. Hal. 2.63, 3f.; 1.64, 4ff.; Ovid Met. 14.581ff.

Psychic Personalities in the Archaic Age

So much for the world of mythology. The demi-gods and heroes of prehistory were acceptable to later centuries as close descendants of the gods. But to the Greeks of the sixth and fifth centuries any notion that sons of gods could have existed in their recent past (towards the end of the so-called archaic age) seems to have been viewed with unequivocal disfavour. In fact a strong line of demarcation was set up between gods and men. Anyone who thought or acted like a god was committing the sacrilegious act of ὕβρις and could expect no mercy from heaven.

This idea certainly lies behind the purple-carpet scene in Aeschylus's Agamemnon. Although the king yields to his wife's request, he openly admitted the impious nature of the deed; λέγω κατ' ἀνδρα, μὴ θεόν, βέβειν ἐμέ (Ag. 925).¹ The theme of Herodotus's Histories is the folly of τὸ μέγα φρονεῖν: god is jealous, as Xerxes, Croesus and others found out to their cost. Herodotus himself at the end of his digression on the Greek and Egyptian Heracles (2.45) judiciously prays that gods and heroes may deal kindly with him for what he has dared to write. Pindar echoes the same sentiments in his Isthmian Odes 5.14f. μὴ μάτερε Ζεὺς γένεσθαι... θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει.² In the Trachiniae Sophocles makes Lichas praise Deianeira as one who θνητὴν φρονούσαν θνητὰ κούκ ἀγνώμονα (Trach. 472-73). The chorus in Euripides Bacchae proclaim: τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία τό τε μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν (Bacch. 395-96), and a fragment of Epicharmus contains the advice: θνατὰ χρὴ τὸν θνατόν, οὐκ ἀθάνατα τὸν θνατόν φρονεῖν (fr. 263 Kaibel = DK 23 B 20).

The evidence would appear fairly conclusive. Of course, in a later age Plato was advocating as the chief end of all life ὁμοίως θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν (Theaetet 176b), and after him Aristotle proclaimed that it was man's aim ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀθανατίζειν (Eth. Nic. 10.1177b, 33).³ Even in the early period, however, the

¹See further Ag. 922-25, 931ff. It is also essentially a Homeric conception. Cf. Hom. Il. 22.1ff.; 6.146ff.

²Cf. Pyth. 3.59; Ol. 5.27.

³For further discussion of this divergent thinking see W. K. C. Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 113-16 and his History of Greek Philosophy Vol. I (Cambridge, 1962), pp. 196ff.

case may not have been so one-sided. The very fact that the deprecation of all thoughts or deeds which transcend man's mortal station was so vehemently urged is of itself a probable indication that in some quarters beliefs contrary to the traditional or orthodox canon were being upheld; or indeed that in or before the sixth and fifth centuries there were known to have existed men who did think, speak and act like "sons of gods". I refer to the number of early seers, psychic healers and so-called shamanistic figures of the late archaic Greek world.

E. R. Dodds defines the Greek shaman as "a psychically unstable person who has received a call to the religious life".¹ That there were such persons in the early Greek world is clear enough, as we shall soon see; but it is impossible to know whether or not they owe their origin to the influence of northern culture after colonization in the Black Sea area.² Their presence is more appropriately explained as a parallel cultural phenomenon. For the analogy with the shaman is not altogether satisfactory. In the North shamanism is a central feature of the tribal system and the shaman acts as priest, medicine-man and psychopomp, or conductor of dead souls; in Greece the shaman appears in isolation and is an exceptional rather than a regular figure of society.³

Whatever the truth, the class of free-lance inspired prophets known under the generic title Bacis or Sibyl is characteristic of the growth in the archaic age of ecstatic religion which gave direct access to a god.⁴ The Trojan princess Cassandra has all the marks of a Sibyl. Although the traditions of her prophetic gift are not attested in Homer, it is noted by Pindar (Pyth. 11.33), and Aeschylus

¹E. R. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational (Cambridge, 1951), p. 140.

²This is the belief of E. R. Dodds, op. cit., pp. 140ff. where he cites the thesis of K. Meuli, "Scythica", Hermes 70 (1935), pp. 137ff. It is questioned by J. A. Philip, Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism (Toronto, 1966), pp. 159-60.

³On shamanism in general see M. Eliade, Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy (London, 1967), especially pp. 387-94.

⁴Aristotle Probl. 30.1, 954a 36. For Bacis see Hdt. 8.20, and 77; Aristophanes Pax 1071; Pausanias 10.12, 6; 4.27, 4. For Sibyl see Pausanias 10.12, 1ff.; Plut. De Pyth. Or. 6; Verg. Aen. 6.36ff.

(Ag. 1203ff.) writes as if the story were already well known.¹

Other psychic personalities possessed additional powers. Abaris the Hyperborean (Hdt. 4.36) is connected with Apollo and said to have carried the god's emblem, a golden arrow, throughout the world without eating food. Porphyry (Vit. Pyth. 29) makes him a contemporary of Pythagoras and the arrow a magic broom-stick which enables him to pass through the sky. Later authorities also credit him with averting a plague, the prediction of an earthquake, and the composition of religious poems (oracles?).²

The legend of Aristeas, as related by Herodotus (4.13ff), contains similar features. Like Abaris, he was the servant of Apollo and was reputed to have "died" in a fuller's shop at his home town on Proconessus and then vanished while his relatives were summoned. At the very same hour he was reported to have been seen and engaged in conversation on the way to Cyzicus. Seven years later Aristeas reappeared and composed his poems on the Arimaspeans. He then vanished again. Two hundred and forty years after his second disappearance he visited the people of Metapontum and ordered the building of an altar to Apollo bearing also his own name, after explaining that the god had once visited their town together with himself in the form of a raven. Again he vanished.³

Bi-location as a result of the separation of body and soul, commonly called "astral travel", and the doctrine of Metempsychosis, which lies unmistakably behind the reference to a raven, serve to connect this shadowy figure with two later *θεῖοι ἄνδρες*, Pythagoras and Apollonius of Tyana.⁴

Another soul-traveller was Hermotimus of Clazomenae, who, according to Diogenes Laertius (8.5, citing Heraclides Ponticus), was a former

¹Suidas s.v. *Σιβυλλᾶ* classes Cassandra under this heading. For one of the most vivid accounts of ecstatic frenzy in a seer cf. Verg. Aen. 6.45-51, 77-80.

²Suidas s.v.; Apollonius Mir. 4; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 28-29; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 91-93, 135-136, 140-41, 215.

³With Herodotus cf. Pliny HN 7.174; Maximus of Tyre 38.3. See also J. D. P. Bolton, Aristeas of Proconessus (Oxford, 1962).

⁴Cf. Philostr. VA 4.10; 3.23; D.L. 8.14; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 29; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 136. Mention of the town Metapontum also serves to connect Aristeas and Pythagoras.

incarnation of Pythagoras. About him Apollonius (Mir. 3) says that his soul made journeys lasting several years, and after it returned to his entranced body Hermotimus was able to relate various incidents which occurred in distant places.

More famous still was Epimenides of Crete. He is said by Cicero (De Div. 1.34) to have uttered frenzied prophecies like a Sibyl. Diogenes Laertius mentions his long hair, unusual for a Cretan (D.L.1.109)-- but very typical of the shamanistic prophet.¹ Epimenides' famous sleep of fifty-seven years in a cave earned him the title θεοφιλίστατος among the Greeks (D.L. 1.110).² He claimed that his soul had passed through many incarnations (ibid. 114), which may explain why the Cretans believed that he lived for nearly three hundred years (ibid. 111).³ The Cretans also on account of his prognostic faculty sacrificed to him ὡς θεῷ (ibid. 114). Once summoned by the Athenians to purify their city from plague, he performed certain chthonian rites and ordered the (sacrificial?) execution of two young men (ibid. 110). He was given by the nymphs a special kind of food and required no further sustenance (ibid. 114, according to Demetrius). It is claimed that he heard voices from heaven (ibid. 115, according to Theopompus).

Herodotus mentions a story about the Thracian god (δαίμων), Zalmoxis, namely that he was really a man who had once been a slave of Pythagoras at Samos. When he bought his freedom, he returned to his native Thrace and preached a doctrine (learnt from Pythagoras?) that men never die. At the same time he undertook the building of an underground chamber down which he "disappeared" for three years and was mourned as if dead. In the fourth year he reappeared to the Thracians, thus confirming the truth of the doctrines he had taught them (Hdt. 4, 94-96).

These "Greek shamans" capable, it would seem, of complete mental

¹Cf. D. L.'s comment on Empedocles' hair (8.73).

²Plutarch (Solon 12) says that Epimenides was called Κούρης νέος. Cf. D.L. 1.115. According to Pausanias (1.14, 3) the sleep lasted forty years.

³Others say 154 or 157 years. Cf. the discrepancy in the floruits of Epimenides. Plato (Leg. 1.642d) puts it as c. 500 B.C., Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 1; cf. Plut. Solon 12; D.L. 1.109-115) prefers c. 600 B.C. See also Pausanias 1.14, 3.

dissociation were familiar to the Greeks of the fifth century as is clear from the words of Orestes in Sophocles' Electra:¹

ἤδη γὰρ εἶδον πολλάκις καὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς
λόγῳ μάτην θνήσκοντας· εἶθ', ὅταν δόμους
ἔλθωσιν αὐθις, ἐκτετίμηνται πλέον. (62-64)

One further individual of the archaic period is outstanding. Lycurgus, the Spartan reformer, if originally a man, was in Herodotus's day considered divine (Hdt. 1.65f.). Both Herodotus and Plutarch quote in slightly different versions the famous utterance of the Delphic priestess that Lycurgus would prove a god (Hdt. 1.65; Plut. Lyc. 5).¹ Both mention his temple and the annual sacrifices ὡς θεῶ (Plut. Lyc. 31). Plutarch adds the blasting of his tomb by lightning—a seal of his divinity.²

Stories of predictions are related of Pherecydes, tutor of Pythagoras (D.L. 1.116), and of Thales (D.L. 1.26) and Solon (D.L. 1.50). But the reputation and achievements of these men in other spheres seems to have prevented any serious shamanistic treatment by later ages.

This is not true, however, for three other Greeks of outstanding wisdom, ability and renown. With the traditions on Pythagoras, Empedocles and Socrates a more complete concept of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ is beginning to take shape in the Greek world. Evidence for the category of θεῖος ἀνὴρ in its most fully developed form belongs to the later Graeco-Roman period. But this does not mean that the category itself was late in origin or that it was suddenly invented at a given moment in time. It is the view of the present writer that the concept evolved gradually over centuries, and it will therefore

¹Some may prefer to see here a reference only to the return of Odysseus, but see E. R. Dodds, op. cit., p. 141.

²Hdt. 1.65 ... δὶβω ἢ σε θεὸν μαντεύσομαι ἢ ἄνθρωπον.
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ καὶ μᾶλλον θεὸν ἔλπομαι, ὦ Λυκόοργε.
and Plut. Lyc. 5 θεοφιλή... καὶ θεὸν μᾶλλον ἢ ἄνθρωπον.

Such an oracle for legislators was of immense value with regard to the endurance of their laws. But political expediency need not necessarily explain the origin of this recognition.

³For the altar cf. Pausanias 3.16, 6 and see also L. R. Farnell, op. cit., pp. 361ff., 424 n. 295a.

be important to discover how far the formal features that are found in the later and more clearly defined biographies of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* are reflected in the deeds, sayings, and legends of these three main predecessors of the type.

Difficulties, sometimes of an insurmountable nature, beset any investigation of the Pythagorean and Socratic legends. With Pythagoras the sources are preserved mainly in works of very late antiquity, with Socrates the evidence of his younger contemporaries is obscured by the political or philosophical tendencies of individual writers. The next chapter has been set apart for as meaningful a discussion as time allows of these problems and their relevance to the concept of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. The sources for Empedocles, however, should cause less embarrassment. Evidence for a personal claim to be divine comes from the fragments of his own poems, and the stories about him preserved in Diogenes Laertius derive from ancient sources.

Empedocles of Acragas

Empedocles (c. 493-433 B.C.) is appropriately described as "one of the most complex and colourful figures of antiquity".¹ He led a very energetic life which won him distinction in the fields of philosophy, science, politics, rhetoric and poetry. Combined with this is his extraordinary career as mystic, wonder-worker and god-on-earth.

Timaeus (D.L. 8.53) says that Empedocles sat at Pythagoras' feet² but was evicted from the school for stealing the Master's doctrine. According to Alcidamas (D.L. 8.56), what he admired in Pythagoras was the solemnity (*σεμνότης*) of his life and bearing. This connection with the earlier *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* may be seen in Fr. 129, which alludes

1

W. K. C. Guthrie, History of Greek Philosophy Vol. II p. 122. See also on Empedocles J. Burnet, Early Greek Philosophy (4th ed. London, 1930), pp. 197ff.; G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, The Presocratic Philosophers (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 320ff. For the fragments see H. Diels, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, edited with additions by W. Kranz (3 vols. 10th ed. Berlin, 1961).

²He probably means a Pythagorean. Cf. D.L. 8.55.

almost certainly to the superhuman knowledge of Pythagoras.¹

His reputation as orator and poet (D.L. 8.57-58) does not concern us, but some aspects of his political activity are not without interest. As ardent democrat and champion of freedom he once refused an offer of sovereignty at Acragas (D.L. 8.63). It was probably indifference to princely rank rather than genuine^o humility that lay behind this course of action. After all, a tyrant was inferior to an incarnate god.² Nevertheless, the lavish generosity with which from his vast wealth he distributed dowries to the impoverished girls of his city seems to have been without dishonourable motive (D.L. 8.73).

As a healer (ἰατρός —D.L. 8.58) Empedocles was very much in the primitive tradition of the medicine-man.³ His reputation is evident from his own writings:⁴

τοῖσιν ἄμ' <εὔτ' > ἂν ἴκωμαι ἐς ἄστεα τηλεθάοντα
 ἀνδράσιν ἢ δὲ γυναῖξί, σεβίβομαι· οἱ δ' ἄμ' ἔπονται
 μυρίου ἐξέρουτες, ὅπῃ πρὸς κέρδος ἀταρπός,
 οἱ μὲν μαντοσυνέων κέχρημένοι, οἱ δ' ἐπὶ νούσων
 παντοίων ἐπύθοντο κλύειν εὐηκέα βᾶξιν,
 δηρὸν δὴ χαλεπήσει πεπαρμένοι <ἀμφ' ὀδύνησιν >.

Pausanias, the friend to whom he dedicates his poem On Nature (Fr. 1), may have been Empedocles' pupil. Certainly he is intended to learn from that poem cures for disease and old age, control over wind and rain, and (even) the raising of the dead (Fr. 111). Elsewhere Pausanias is addressed as healer and a descendant of Asclepius and he is credited with the power to save men from death's very door (Fr. 156).

1

See Kirk and Raven, op. cit., p. 219. The doctrine of transmigration and the kinship of all living things is common to Pythagoras and Empedocles. The latter recommends abstinence from flesh, laurel-leaves and beans. See Frs. 136, 139, 141, and Kirk and Raven, op. cit., p. 224.

²See J. Gomperz, Greek Thinkers, Eng. Transl. by L. Magnus and G. G. Berry (4 vols. London, 1901-12), I p. 228.

³J. Burnet, op. cit., p. 199; W. K. C. Guthrie, op. cit., p. 132.

⁴Fr. 112 ll. 7-12. Empedocles also composed in 600 lines a poem on healing (Ἰατρικὸς λόγος —D.L. 8.77).

These were the powers which Empedocles believed that he himself could grant.

He was also something of a showman. As Guthrie has pointed out, medicine at that time was not separated from philosophy on the one hand and religion and magic on the other hand.¹ Diodorus of Ephesus (D.L. 8.70) says that he emulated Anaximander in his pretentious behaviour and theatrical dress. From his vast wealth, Favorinus says (D.L. 8.73), he was able to afford a purple robe, a golden girdle and bronze sandals. On his thick hair he wore a Delphic laurel-wreath and was attended by a train of young boys. All this together with his perpetually solemn demeanour gave him a royal stamp wherever and whenever he appeared (*ibid.*). It was his own experience that men and women worshipped him (Fr.112; D.L.8.70). And at Olympia he demanded extraordinary deference with a result that he became the chief topic of conversation (D.L. 8.66).

It is natural that such flamboyant behaviour would bring ridicule upon him. Many saw in him only the charlatan. According to Satyrus (D.L. 8.58), Gorgias of Leontini says that he himself was present when Empedocles practised sorcery (γοητεύειν). His followers in medicine were upbraided by the rival school at Cos: they are called by Hippocrates μάγου τε καὶ καθάρτου καὶ ἀγύρτου καὶ ἀλαβόνης (Hippoc. Περὶ ἰερῆς νόσου ch. 1).²

Nevertheless, this capacity for sensational remedies earned Empedocles genuine recognition from many of his contemporaries. Here the enigmatic quality of the θεός ἀνὴρ is fully displayed. To the unbeliever his miracles will always be due to trickery, to the believer they are the manifestation of his divine power.

Three famous wonders are recorded. Each one is capable of a rational explanation and there seems little reason to doubt their reality. Men who were ahead of their time in terms of inventiveness and practical knowledge have often incurred notoriety as magicians.³

1

W. K. C. Guthrie, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

2

See J. Burnet, *op. cit.*, p. 200. Cf. the ridicule in the epigrams of D.L. 8.74-75; cf. Lucian Icaromenippus 13.

3

Cf. the careers of Galileo, Roger Bacon, John Dee, and others. For the historical probability of these wonders see W. K. C. Guthrie, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-34; C. J. de Vogel, Greek Philosophy (3 vols. Leiden, 1959), I p. 52.

In the first wonder Timaeus (D.L. 8.60) relates how he saved crops from serious damage when the trade winds were blowing violently by stretching out bags of ass's hide at different places on the hill-tops "in order to catch the wind". The success of this action won for Empedocles the name *κωλυσανέμας*.¹ In the second, Heraclides (D.L. 8.61 and 67) tells how he woke up (from catalepsy) a woman whose body had lain for thirty days "without pulse or breath". For this reason Heraclides calls him not merely healer but *μάντις* (*ibid.*). Finally (D.L. 8.70), when the citizens of Selinus were aggravated by a deadly plague which was caused by the contaminated flow of their river, Empedocles supervised at his own expense the infiltration of the river by two cleaner streams near by. After the pestilence had thus subsided and the people were celebrating by the riverside, he appeared among them and they rose to their feet and worshipped (*προσκυνεῖν*) and prayed to him as to a god (*καθ' ἑαυτὸν θεῶν*).²

Recognition of Empedocles as quasi-divine should come as no surprise when the claim he makes in his own poetry is taken into consideration:³

ὦ φίλοι, οἱ μέγα ἄστει κατὰ ξανθοῦ Ἀκράγαντος
ναίειτ' ἄν' ἄκρα πόλεος, ἀγαθῶν μελεδήμονες ἔργων,
ξείνων αἰδοῖσθε λιμένες, κακότητος ἄπειροι,
Χαίρετ'· ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν θεὸς ἄμβροτος, οὐκέτι θνητὸς
πωλεῦμαι μετὰ πᾶσι τετιμένος, ὥσπερ εἰκόμην,
ταίνιαις τε περίσσεπτος δέφεγν' τε θαλείου.

The reason for this god-complex (*θεός* here, not *θεός*) may be found in the teachings of Empedocles. In the Purifications he preaches a doctrine of man's Fall and the necessity for all but the

¹The word becomes *Ἀλεξανέμας* in Porph. Vit. Pyth. 29, *Ἀλεξανέμος* in Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 136. The miracle may have its origin in the device of a windbreak.

²Cf. the scepticism of Timaeus (D.L. 8.71-72). Although Heraclides is not always trustworthy, there is nothing improbable about this story. The plague at Selinus is certainly historical and confirmed by contemporary coins. See B. V. Head, Historia Numorum (2nd ed. London, 1911), pp. 167f. and Coins of Ancient Sicily (London, 1903), pp. 83f.

³Fr. 112 ll. 1-6. For the remainder of this fragment see above, p. 19. Cf. Fr. 113 "But why do I harp on these things, as if it were any great matter that I should surpass mortal, perishable man".

gods to pass through the wheel of birth in many reincarnations. This message is proclaimed with the righteous indignation of a Juvenal and the moral earnestness of the Old Testament prophets.¹ Escape from endless rebirth is obtained only through gradual purification in previous lives.² Empedocles regards himself as a fallen δαίμων condemned to an exile lasting 30,000 years—τῶν καὶ ἐγὼ νῦν εἶμι, φυγὰς θεόθεν καὶ ἀλήτης (Fr. 115 l.13).³ For the wandering soul there is a hierarchy of living things. Empedocles, who no less than Pythagoras, has retained the memory of his former existences, tells us how he has already been a boy, a girl, a bush, a bird and a fish (Fr. 117). The highest incarnation was into human life, and on the top grade of that scale were prophets, poets, healers, and princes (Frs. 146 and 147). In his present life Empedocles was now all of these! The next step was to arise as a god and share with the other immortals their hearth and table, becoming safe from rebirth and without further sorrow or harm—ἐνθεν ἀναβλαστοῦσι θεοὶ τιμῆσι φέριστοι, κτλ. (*ibid.*). It was this stage that Empedocles was contemplating when he spoke of himself as "an immortal god, no mortal now" (Fr. 112). At last having climbed so far, he had reached the final rung of the ladder and now on the verge of escape he anticipated his promotion while still on earth.⁴

It is in the accounts of his death that the really miraculous elements accrue to Empedocles' legend. It may be supposed that

¹In Fr. 114 he speaks of the truth, which he knows, as being difficult for men; and so, like most religious philosophers, he dealt in ἀποκαλύψεις.

²This includes many of the Pythagorean abstinences. Cf. Frs. 136, 137, 139, 140, 141.

³Cf. Fr. 119 "From what honour, from what a height of bliss have I fallen to go about among mortals here on earth".

⁴On the alleged inconsistency between the soul that breaks up at death (On Nature) and the doctrine of reincarnation (Purifications) see Kirk and Raven, op. cit., pp. 355-60. They allow Empedocles the distinction between the θυμός of Homer (= physical consciousness) and the ψυχή (= immortal life-soul), and they quote Plut. De Exil. 17, 607d—a possible paraphrase of part of the Purifications--as evidence for the belief. See also W. K. C. Guthrie, op. cit., pp. 122-28, 248, 263-64.

opposition or loss of popular favour drove him from Acragas to the Peloponnese where he died of old age, a stranger in a strange land. (D.L. 8.67). But the ancients deemed this death unworthy of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, and so the wonder-stories survive.

Diogenes Laertius recounts side by side natural and supernatural traditions of his death. His age was either sixty, seventy-seven, or, more appropriately for a godlike man, one hundred and nine years (D.L. 8.73-74). Of the natural accounts of his death Favorinus (?) says that falling from his car on a journey to Messene, he broke his leg and later died (D.L. 8.73). According to Telauges (D.L. 8.74), enfeebled by old age, he fell into the sea and drowned. Timaeus (D.L. 8.71) maintains that he was last heard of in the Peloponnese.

The holiest tradition is preserved, perhaps naturally, by Heraclides Ponticus (D.L. 8.67-68). After celebrating a sacrificial feast with his friends, Empedocles was apparently snatched up to heaven during the night. When at daybreak a search was made, one of the servants said that in the middle of the night he had heard a supernaturally loud voice summoning Empedocles, and on getting up he saw "a heavenly light and the gleam of torches, but nothing else". Later Pausanias called off the search, *φάσκων εὐχῆς ἄξια συμβεβηκέναι καὶ θύειν αὐτῷ δεῖν καθάπερ εἰ γεγονότι θεῷ*.

A different version of this disappearance is given by Hippobotus (D.L. 8.69). He says that Empedocles got up and made his way to Mt. Etna and, when he reached the crater, he leapt in so as to confirm the rumour that he had become a god. Unfortunately, however, the volcano erupted soon afterwards and brought up one of his famous bronze sandals, thus exposing the charlatan!¹

It was clearly Diogenes Laertius's own opinion that Empedocles was a mountebank. For he composes derogatory epigrams on the manner of his death (D.L. 8.74-75). But the controversial nature of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is demonstrated in the existence pari passu of reverential and scurrilous stories. His reputation was long-lasting. Many statues are attested (D.L. 8.72), and Lucretius, who praises the scientist in Empedocles, declares that Sicily has produced nothing more illustrious, more sacred, more wonderful or more precious; and

¹Cf. Lucian Dial. Mort. 20.4.

the poems that were fashioned in his divine breast reveal such glorious secrets that he seems scarcely of human origin (Lucr. 1.726-33).

nil tamen hoc habuisse viro praeclarius in se
nec sanctum magis et mirum carumque videtur.
Carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius
vociferantur et exponunt praeclara reperta,
ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus.

Where could one find more conclusive proof of the survival for four centuries of this man's double renown as philosopher and as *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* ?

CHAPTER II

THE PYTHAGOREAN AND SOCRATIC TRADITIONS

A COMPARISON IN SOURCE CRITICISM

At the origins of almost every great movement of human thought the investigator will find the following paradox: he may know enough to affirm that each was indebted to the initiative and influence of one personality, but not enough always to detach this personality from the obscurities and contradictions of his legend. This is the problem of Pythagoras; it is also the problem of Socrates.

With these two there is a further difficulty. The biographer of a great thinker usually has at his disposal at least two sorts of material. First, there are the man's writings, comprising all that he once said or thought; secondly, there are the various interpretations of the man and his writings, from his own time to the present day, by others. Thus for Empedocles in addition to the opinions of later writers there has survived the personal claim to divinity in his own poems.¹ But Socrates, so far as we know, wrote nothing, and Pythagoras' books, if indeed he did write, cannot be distinguished from the works and achievements of later Pythagoreans. Neither tells posterity about himself in the same way as Empedocles has done, and our knowledge of them comes only from what others have judged useful to leave us. Moreover, each became a legend soon after his death, if not in his own lifetime. Inevitably, therefore, if our intention were to separate the man from the legend, we should in the end be handling what is at least in part also legend! It

¹On the other hand, the fact that Empedocles founded no school and left no successors means that his legend lacks both the detail and the long history of the Pythagorean tradition. Lone voices in a wilderness tend only vaguely to be remembered.

would be almost impossible to avoid movement in a circle. However, the separation of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* from his legend is unnecessary. For it is usually precisely because of the legend that he is a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. A personal claim, fully attested, to supplement the legend is useful; but a continuous legend remains the essential factor which secures the recognition of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.

Difficulties with the Sources for Pythagoras

The problems with the sources for a life of Pythagoras are too well known to be stated in detail here.¹ The main evidence for Pythagoras as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* comes from sources preserved in the late works of Iamblichus and Porphyry. Some early scholars have accepted this tradition in its entirety as authentic.² More recently, all or most of it has been dismissed as late invention.³ Neither of the two extreme positions can really be held, but who is to say which is nearer the truth? If the later authorities did not invent everything, there will be a basic minimum of unknown quantity which has its origins in earlier times. Some of this can be determined—fortunately Porphyry, like Diogenes Laertius, often quotes his sources—and it will be one purpose of the following pages to define the amount of early legend that concerns Pythagoras as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. Again, if there was sufficient body to the early legend for men to class Pythagoras as in some way divine, could and did this influence Philostratus in his life of a later *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, Apollonius of Tyana? Indeed did Apollonius's Life of Pythagoras,

¹For a full account of the difficulties see W. K. C. Guthrie, A History of Greek Philosophy, I pp. 148ff. A bibliography that would do justice to the history of the discussion is impossible here. Important contributions are cited in the course of the footnotes.

²E. g. E. Rohde, "Die Quellen des Iamblichos in seiner Biographie des Pythagoras", Rhein. Mus. 26 (1871), pp. 554-76; and 27 (1872), pp. 23-61. I. Lévy, Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore (Paris, 1926), and La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine (Paris, 1927).

³See J. A. Philip, "The Biographical Tradition - Pythagoras" TAPA 90 (1959), pp. 185-94, and Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism (Toronto, 1966).

quoted by Porphyry (Vit. Pyth. 2) in turn serve as a pattern for Philostratus's Life of Apollonius? Or is there a danger in looking too closely at "parallel" lives? Is the parallel between Apollonius of Tyana and Pythagoras a natural one to be expected because Apollonius was after all a practising Pythagorean who based his way of life on that of the master? And if that were simply the case, could the later biographies of Pythagoras have been influenced by the fuller treatment given by Philostratus to Apollonius?

If we are to discover the answers to these questions, an investigation of the early evidence (before Philostratus) for a conception of Pythagoras as *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* becomes necessary. Four stages may be indicated in the tradition. First, information from contemporaries and those of the next generations, that is from the sixth and fifth centuries, will show that soon after Pythagoras' death a legend was beginning to take shape which was in no way inconsistent with the general picture of the later tradition. The second period seems to be the fourth and early third centuries, when men who could not match the originality of Plato and Aristotle exercised their writing talents in composing histories of philosophies and philosophers. Aristoxenus was the first to write a *βίος Πυθαγόρου*,¹ and Aristotle himself was encouraged to write *περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορείων*. But these two treatises share the fate of nearly everything that was written about Pythagoras down to the third century of this era: we know of them only from quotations, not necessarily verbatim, in later authors. The third stage may take us from the third century to the time of Philostratus. For this lengthy period very few quotations survive. Among the names mentioned by the later biographers, only to Apollonius of Tyana can a *βίος* with any certainty be attributed.² There is, however, valuable information in Lucian and others against which the pre-Philostratean view of Pythagoras can be checked. The last stage in the tradition ends with the colourful biographies of Porphyry and Iamblichus, which are variously regarded as unoriginal compilations of a now lost legend or as pious inventions appropriate only to that later age.

¹K. von Fritz, Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy (Columbia, 1940), p. 7.

²See below, p. 141.

Nearer in time to Philostratus than to these early neo-Platonists, Diogenes Laertius quotes from and names sources of ancient origin. The conception of his work is totally different from that of Porphyry and Iamblichus, and when he does shed light on Pythagoras as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* he becomes a precious authority.¹

Θεῖος Ἄνθρωπος in the Pythagorean Legend

Contemporary and early sources

The first signs of literary evidence for Pythagoras belong to the fifth century. The testimonies in part disparaging and in part laudatory are characteristic of the ambiguity and controversy which is always seen to surround a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. The earliest evidence, that of Xenophanes and Heraclitus, is ironical. The former in elegiacs ridicules Pythagoras the superman who remembers not only his previous lives but also his previous friends, one of whom (so the story runs) he recognized in the yelp of a whipped dog (D.L. 8.36= Fr. 7).² His reputation for wisdom and intelligence Heraclitus puts down to *πολυμαθία* (D.L. 9.1 = Fr. 40; D.L. 8.6 = Fr. 129) and *κακοτεχνία* (D.L. 8.6 = Fr. 129). He also calls him *κοπίδων ἀρχηγός* (Fr. 81). Herodotus, on the other hand, calls him "not the weakest *σοφιστής* among the Greeks" (4.95). Empedocles speaks in more enthusiastic terms about "a man of superhuman knowledge (*περιώσια εἰδώς*), who had acquired the greatest wealth of wisdom and was skilled in all sorts of clever works; for whenever he strained with all his mind, he saw with ease every single thing that happened in ten, yes, even twenty generations" (Fr. 129, cf. D.L. 8.54; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 30).³ Knowledge of the past is seen here to be a

¹On the sources and nature of Diogenes Laertius's remarkable collection of Lives see A. Delatte, La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laërce (Brussels, 1922), especially, pp. 34ff.; R. D. Hicks, Introduction to the Loeb edition, (London, 1925), vol. I pp. ix ff.; R. Hope, The Book of Diogenes Laertius (New York, 1930).

²References to the fragments are those in H. Diels, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, edited with additions by W. Kranz. See also G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, The Pre-Socratic Philosophers, pp. 217ff.

³There is no reason to doubt the attribution of this fragment. See G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, op. cit., p. 219.

psychically exhausting achievement. This together with isolated references in some fifth-century poets¹ is all that survives of the early evidence.

Within the next two or three generations a legend had formed which gave colour to the Pythagoras of the fourth century. To what extent the extraordinary facts about his life and person which now appear were known earlier cannot be assessed. They certainly will not have grown out of nothing, and it is probable that from time to time secret veneration as well as secret doctrines escaped the Pythagorean net of silence. For example, if Aristophanes' audience is to appreciate the jokes in the Clouds about the brotherhood of insular scholars, it must be well acquainted with the activities and reputation of the Pythagorean discipleship at Athens.²

The fourth century

Ridicule in the Middle and New Comedy is more direct and more informative. Abstinence, inanimate sacrifices, dirtiness, silence and hope in a reward beyond the grave all come under attack.³ The comedians were referring, no doubt, to the community rather than to its founder, and to those second-class followers who later became known as Pythagorists or Acousmatics.⁴ But the extract quoted in D.L. 8.38 from the Pythagorist of Aristophon (? 350 B.C.) contains

¹E. g. Cratinus (D.L. 8.37 = Meineke, FCC III 376) and Ion of Chios (D.L. 1.120 = Fr. 4 Bergk). The latter's allusion to the immortality, according to Pythagoras' theories, of the soul of Pherecydes may be derogatory, for he also accuses Pythagoras of forging Orphic writings (D.L. 8.8).

Democritus is said to have praised Pythagoras in a work of the same name (D.L. 9.38, cf. 46), but there is no further mention of this work in antiquity.

²J. S. Morrison, "The Origins of Plato's Philosopher-statesman" CQ Nov. 1958, sees Aristophanes' Clouds as evidence for the Pythagorean συνέδριον in all its constituent parts. J. A. Philip, Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism, pp. 138, 142f., would deny the historicity of a brotherhood in the Greek world before the Christian era. The single reference in Plato Resp. 600a-b certainly speaks in terms of a distinct group of disciples. See also G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, op. cit., pp. 219ff. especially p. 221.

³See A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, Select Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets (Oxford, 1900), pp. 69f., 86; J. Burnet, Early Greek Philosophy (4th ed. London, 1930), p. 94 and note. The Pythagorean 'silence' is confirmed by Isocrates Busiris 29.

⁴See Porph. Vit. Pyth. 37; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 81, 87. Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, op. cit., p. 191; G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, op. cit., p. 227.

an early reference to the legend that Pythagoras (in the style of the primitive *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*) travelled to Hades.¹

The earliest sources for a tradition about Pythagoras himself are to be found, perhaps not surprisingly, in the early Academy. Heraclides Ponticus and Aristotle, two contemporary pupils of Plato, were apparently the first to record about Pythagoras what was known in their own day. Their original works are lost, but if we can place some trust in the authorities who quote them, a substantial legend seems to have formed by the time of the fourth century B.C.

The literary reputation of Heraclides Ponticus is well attested (D.L. 5.86, 89; Plut. de aud. poet. 1.14e; Cic. Tusc. Disp. 5.3, 8); so also is his fascination for things strange and supernatural (Timaeus apud D.L. 8.72, Cic. Nat. D. 1.13, 4). It should cause little surprise to find among his works two treatises On the Soul, one On Hades, another on the Pythagoreans, and one entitled Abaris (D.L. 5.86-88; Plut. de aud. poet. 1.14c). He must surely have found the "shamanistic" Pythagoras and Abaris ideal subjects for his imaginative literary tastes. And as the peripatetic tradition knew the legend that Abaris had recognized Pythagoras as the Hyperborean Apollo,² it would not be unreasonable to suspect that Heraclides also used, if he did not invent, the same story.

The one established recital from Heraclides contains the famous list of Pythagoras' former lives. In it (D.L. 8.4) Pythagoras names as his previous incarnations Aethalides (a son of Hermes granted the power of anamnesis), Euphorbus, Hermotimus (as whom he identifies Euphorbus's shield), and Pyrrhus (a shepherd).³ This fragment not only serves to bring Pythagoras into line with archaic soul-travellers—he is actually identified with Hermotimus⁴—it also confirms the early evidence (cited above) of Xenophanes and Empedocles.

I. Lévy would see the tradition for a Catabasis starting with Heraclides.⁵ It is true that at least one serious account of a

¹For the ridicule of New Comedy see further Athenaeus 4.161.

²See below, p. 35.

³Cf. Porph. Vit. Pyth. 26.

⁴On Hermotimus and other soul-travellers see above, ch. I, pp.15ff.

⁵I. Lévy, Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore, pp. 22ff., 36ff.; cf. idem La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine, pp. 79. For other ancient treatises On Hades cf. D.L. 5.87; 6.17; 9.46; 9.55.

journey to Hades ought to have existed before Aristophon's parody in Middle Comedy (see above, p. 29) and the later parody of Hermippus, who seems to have stolen the story of Zalmoxis and applied it irreverently to Pythagoras (D.L. 8.41, cf. Hdt. 4.95).¹ But the earliest known evidence for a serious Catabasis comes from Hieronymus of Rhodes (at Athens c. 290-30), who lived after Aristophon but possibly before Hermippus.² Hieronymus says (D.L. 8.21) that when Pythagoras had gone down to Hades he saw the soul of Hesiod bound fast to a bronze column and shrieking and the soul of Homer hanging from a tree with serpents writhing about it; both were being punished for their remarks about the gods.

Now the two surviving fragments of Heraclides' "Abaris" dialogue both describe a scene in Hades.³ The ideas and language used closely resemble the extract of Hieronymus. Both deal with torments of the condemned, one mentions a tree, the other snakes. Is it not possible that Abaris and Pythagoras visited Hades together as traveller and guide? After all, Hermes guided Heracles, the Sibyl guided Aeneas, in the lost romance of Antonius Diogenes the dead Myrto guided Derkyllis, and in Lucian's parody Mithrobarzanes guided Menippus. Even in the Platonic myths it is normal for a *δαίμων* to guide the soul to the underworld.

At all events, a Catabasis does belong to the early tradition. For Hermippus (D.L. 8.41) makes Pythagoras retire to Italy to a subterranean chamber, where his mother was to send down written messages of all that happened in his absence. When he returned looking like a human skeleton, he informed everyone that he had been down to Hades⁴ and even read out to them all that had taken place! The people literally hang on his every word and believe him to be divine (*θεῖόν τινα*). The satirical nature of this piece is discernible from the initial inclusion of Pythagoras' mother in the plot and from the very humorous touch towards the end, where with unabashed effrontery the sage reads off to every-

¹On Zalmoxis see above, p. 16.

²Hieronymus, a Peripatetic, was a contemporary of the two Academics, Arcesilaus and Lyco (D.L. 4.41; 5.68). Hermippus was a younger contemporary of Callimachus (c. 305 - c. 240 B.C.).

³For these fragments and for the interpretation which follows see I. Lévy, Recherches sur les sources, pp. 24ff.

⁴D.L. 8.14 states that Pythagoras wrote somewhere that he returned to the land of the living after 207 years in Hades.

one's amazement the list of events secretly sent down to him,¹ and the gullible Italians recognize him as a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. But the fact remains that for this literary caricature to be fully appreciated a similar kind of legend must have existed as a serious and holy one.

Iamblichus (Vit. Pyth. 178), though not necessarily from an early source, adds to the tradition. After the Sybarite uprising an ambassador to Croton, whose father now dead had been responsible for the murders of certain Pythagoreans, taunted Pythagoras with his superhuman powers. "On your next visit to Hades", he said, "I will give you a letter to take to my father and you can bring back his reply." To this mockery the sage replied more earnestly, "I am not going to the place of the condemned".

Naturally, not all of this may be read back to Heraclides. But if his reputation for colourful and sensational description is deserved, though many will be pleased to have been spared the tedious falsification, the loss of his treatment of the Pythagorean legend will be a serious one.

If Heraclides was chiefly responsible for an early Academic interpretation of Pythagoras, the Peripatetic tradition goes back to Aristotle himself. Ancient writers refer to his treatise On The Pythagoreans (D.L. 8.34; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 31), or mention his name as authority for various statements on Pythagoras (Apollonius Hist. Mir. 6; Apuleius De deo Socr. 20; Clem. Al. Strom. 6.6, 53; Aul. Gell. NA 4.11; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 41).² Whether it was Aristotle or one of his pupils who wrote this work, its existence long before the neo-Platonists wrote is beyond question.³ For the most part it is preserved by Apollonius the paradoxographer (c. 2nd century B.C.) and Aelian (c. A.D. 170-235).⁴ From the few precious testimonies

¹I. Lévy, La légende de Pythagore, pp. 130ff., wants to see traces in D.L. of a "sealed letter" legend in which Pythagoras, like Iarchus (Philostr. VA 3.16) and Alexander of Abonuteichos (Lucian Alex. 19-21), miraculously reads the contents of an unopened document.

²Aristotle mentions Pythagoras by name only twice (Met. A5, 986a 30; Rhet. B23, 1398b 14), but he often refers to the so-called Pythagoreans. See G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, op. cit., p. 218.

³On the question of its authenticity see I. Levy, Recherches sur la sources de la legende, p. 11; cf. G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, op. cit., p. 218.

⁴See Frs. 191 (Apollonius Hist. Mir. 6; Aelian VH 2.26; 4.17; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 140-43) and 192 (Iambl. ibid. 30-31) in the Teubner edition of V. Rose (repr. Stuttgart, 1966).

based on this document a colourful biographical tradition about Pythagoras can be pieced together. And this time there is more material to work on than was found to be the case with Heraclides Ponticus.

First, there is Apollonius's preliminary statement that Pythagoras, after working hard at mathematics and numbers, later did not refrain from the wonder-working (τέρατα ποιῶν) of Pherecydes (Hist. Mir. 6 = DK 14, 7). Both sages predicted shipwrecks, earthquakes--in each case by drinking from a well--and the capture of Messene and Sybaris respectively. Porphyry (apud Eusebium Praep. Ev. 10.3, 6ff.) says that all three miracles are verified by the fourth-century historian Andron of Ephesus.¹ Another prediction about a cargo-vessel that contained a corpse is related by Apollonius (ibid.; cf. Porph. Vit. Pyth. 28; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 142).

The neo-Platonists add further miracles which had by time become the stock attributes of a θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, namely the expulsion of plagues, the calming of violent winds, hail and turbulent rivers. They also admit that similar wonders were performed by Empedocles, Epimenides and Abaris, thus probably guaranteeing for us the ancient attribution of them to Pythagoras also (Porph. Vit. Pyth. 29; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 136ff.). An interesting part of this tradition on the control of the elements is the story (not in Iamblichus) that the river Cosa, or Nessus, or Caucasus was heard to have addressed Pythagoras in a great and superhuman voice (Apollonius Hist. Mir. 6; Aelian VH 2.26; 4.17; D.L. 8.11; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 27). The discrepancy of names shows that this legend received a wide dispersion.

The earlier mention of Abaris, who with his golden arrow was enabled to travel over earth, sea and sky, paves the way in Iamblichus (Vit. Pyth. 134, 136) and Porphyry (Vit. Pyth. 29) for an explanation of the claim that Pythagoras was seen at the same hour on the same day in Metapontum (Italy) and Tauromenium (Sicily). He could like Abaris travel through the air! This primitive bi-location is attested in the earlier sources, Tauromenium becoming Croton

¹Cf. Apollonius ibid.; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 28; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 136. For Pherecydes cf. D.L. 1.116. According to Porphyry (Eusebius ibid.) Theopompus stole the miracles from Andron and applied them falsely to Pherecydes. Perhaps Andron was a contemporary of Aristotle.

(Apollonius Hist. Mir. 6; Aelian VH 2.26; 4.17, citing Nicomachus as well as Aristotle) or Thurii (Philostr. VA 4.10).

Belonging to the Peripatetic legend is the knowledge displayed of the previous incarnations of other people. Pythagoras recalled that Myllios the Crotoniate was formerly Midas the Phrygian, son of Gordius (Aelian VH 4.17; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 143).

Power and influence over the animal world, if we may judge from the Lives of Christian saints, was a popular conception for the holy man. Pythagoras too possessed this power. Apollonius (Hist. Mir. 6) relates how when bitten by a poisonous snake in Tyrrenia Pythagoras himself bit and killed the reptile. Iamblichus says that he caught and dismissed deadly serpents in Sybaris and Tyrrenia (Vit. Pyth. 142). More famous and better attested is the eagle which at Croton allowed Pythagoras to tame or stroke it (Aelian VH 4.17; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 142; cf. Plut. Num. 65). In another version it was at Olympia where the eagle--sacred to Zeus particularly in the temple there (see Pausanias 5.11, 1)--thus confirmed, so to speak, divine approval of Pythagoras' life (Porph. Vit. Pyth. 25; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 62).

Again the later writers add to the tradition on animals from other (unnamed) sources. Taking as his witness certain "older accounts", Porphyry (Vit. Pyth. 23) relates how Pythagoras once checked a Daunian bear from harassing the local inhabitants and after feeding it for a long time on barley-bread and fruit he bound it by an oath no longer to touch flesh. Once set free, the bear made for the hills, never to be seen again. Iamblichus gives both this version (Vit. Pyth. 60) and a different account at Caulonia of the prediction of the death of a white bear before it was made known (ibid. 142). The variation in places again demonstrates the local origin of these legends in oral tradition. Porphyry, continuing from his older accounts, says that at Tarentum when Pythagoras espied an ox eating green beans, he immediately advised the herdsman to bid the animal desist. As the man with a grin confessed his ignorance of "oxish", Pythagoras whispered in the animal's ear the command not only to withdraw from the bean-field but never to touch beans again (Vit. Pyth. 24; cf. Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 61).¹

¹Iamblichus (ibid.) compares Pythagoras to Orpheus in respect of his dominion over the animal world.

It is, of course, possible that in some, though by no means all, cases the later writers have embellished more ancient accounts which lacked any miraculous element. A good example of this is the story told in Apuleius (Apol. 31) and Plutarch (Quaest. Conv. 729d-e) of Pythagoras buying up catches of fish and returning them to the sea. In its simple form this is an illustration of Pythagoras' doctrine of the kinship of all living things and abstinence from animal foods. But when Iamblichus and Porphyry take up the story, they make Pythagoras declare the exact number of fish in a full net, and not one fish dies on dry land during the long count. (Porph. Vit. Pyth. 25; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 36).

Perhaps the most important part of this early tradition is the more positive recognition of Pythagoras as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. There are a number of testimonies for this. Aelian (VH 4.17) says that Pythagoras used to teach men that he was sprung from higher than mortal stock (*ὅτι κρείττονων γεγένηται σπερμάτων ἢ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τὴν θνητῆν*). In the same section he maintains that the contemporaries of Pythagoras attended as closely to his words as if he were a divine oracle (*ὡς χρησμῶν θεῶν*).

Identification with Hyperborean Apollo was easily the favourite tradition, whether it was the Crotoniates who recognized him as such (Aelian VH 2.26; D.L. 8.11; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 30) or his fellow shaman Abaris (Porph. Vit. Pyth. 28; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 91-93, 140-41). In the neo-Platonic accounts Pythagoras rewards the pious perception of Abaris by revealing to him his golden thigh as confirmation of divinity. The earlier authorities say simply that it was displayed in the theatre, or at Olympia, or somewhere else (Apollonius Hist. Mir. 6; Aelian VH 2.26; 4.17; D.L. 8.11; cf. Plut. Num. 65). In what may be suspected as a later addition to this episode Iamblichus makes Pythagoras tell Abaris that he had taken upon himself human form in order best to reveal his teaching to mankind (Vit. Pyth. 93).

Belief in Pythagoras as godlike is further verified by a statement in Iamblichus on Aristotle's authority. Here Iamblichus, probably stating his own interpretation, claims that Pythagoras' doctrines were considered worthy of belief because he who first spoke them was *οὐχ ὁ τυχῶν ἀλλὰ θεός* (Vit. Pyth. 140). It is, however, not always certain who this "god" is, and so many possible names are given--Hyperborean Apollo, the Pythian Apollo, Paeon, some other Olympian, a benevolent demon, a demon inhabiting the moon

(Vit. Pyth. 30-31)¹—that the idea is clearly part of a multifarious and ancient tradition which possibly goes back to the oral legend of the early disciples. "But", as Iamblichus continues (ibid.), "Aristotle in his work on the Pythagorean philosophy tells us that among their arcana they maintain the following division: of rational creatures there are three sorts; there is god, man, and such as Pythagoras" (τοῦ λογικοῦ βίου τὸ μὲν ἔστι θεός, τὸ δ' ἄνθρωπος, τὸ δὲ οἶον Πυθαγόρας).² We may compare a reference to another enigmatical saying: "man, bird, and a third thing are bipeds". The third creature, says Iamblichus, is Pythagoras (Vit. Pyth. 144, cf. 56). Here the allusion is probably to a δαίμων, a Platonic category half-way between man and god (Sympos. 202e). Later the words θεῖος ἀνὴρ were more normally applied, but the concept is always the same.

In summary, then, the tradition which goes back at least to the paradoxographer of the second century B.C. who cites Aristotle as his source incorporates the recognition of Pythagoras as Apollo, or some other god, or at least as belonging to an order neither completely human nor completely divine, stories of predictions, bi-location, a golden thigh, recognition by a river-god, and a miraculous power over snakes. To this may or may not be added other powers generally associated with early shamanistic figures, namely the control over the elements and influence over animals.³ It is to be remembered that Iamblichus and Porphyry are not above embellishing and interpreting the ancient details in order to fit Pythagoras into the more fully

¹Is this last possibility (the moon-demon) the reason for Timaeus's mockery of Heraclides Ponticus in D.L. 8.72; "(H.P.) is a regular collector of nonsense, telling us even that a man dropped down from the moon"?

²Rose Fr. 192. J. A. Philip, op. cit., pp. 156ff., doubts the authenticity of this statement because he does not believe in arcana before the Christian era. But it was certainly known to Philo who uses a very similar formula to describe Moses (VM 1.27, see below, p.230). I am convinced of the Peripatetic origin of the statement. Aristotle's own love of classification, which pervades the entire spectrum of his works from the Poetics to the History of Animals, is nowhere more vividly or more splendidly demonstrated.

³Aristotle is also the authority cited for various abstinences (Aul. Gell. NA 4.11; D.L. 8.11; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 45), for taboos or "symbolic" teachings (D.L. 8.34; Porph. ibid. 41-42) and for the belief of Pythagoreans in demons (Apuleius de Deo Socr. 20; Clem. Alex. Strom. 6.6, 53). Abstinences are also vouched for by Eudoxus (Porph. Vit. Pyth. 7).

developed category of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* which was familiar in their own day. The closing words of Apollonius, however, contain a salutary warning: "There are other strange stories told about Pythagoras, but not wishing to make work for the copyist we will say no more of him" (Hist. Mir. 6). We may never know precisely how much more of the neo-Platonists' portrait can be read back to previous centuries. a/

Hellenistic biographies

If the fifth and fourth centuries preserved the record of Pythagoras' religious doctrine and his reputation for the psychic powers appropriate to a religious life, the Hellenistic biographers preferred to transmit the scientific and practical teachings of his versatile mind. The legend of the wonder-worker, though not entirely lost, seems to have gone underground and it is replaced by a rationalized legend which depicts Pythagoras as an enlightened intellectual pursuing scientific research and at the same time engaging in practical politics in southern Italy.¹

However, the attempts to correct the legend led only to a greater confusion and diversification. The variance in almost contemporary authorities (Neannes, Satyrus, Hermippus, Dicaearchus) on the manner of Pythagoras' death demonstrates the chaotic state of the tradition (D.L. 8.39; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 55ff.; Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 251 ff.).

But occasionally evidence for the continuation of a hagiographic tradition appears. For example, it is from Timaeus that Porphyry includes the item about the house of Pythagoras being turned into a temple of Demeter and the street becoming a Museion (Vit. Pyth. 4). Diogenes Laertius cites from Timaeus the statement of Pythagoras that *κοινὰ τὰ φίλων εἶναι καὶ φιλίαν ἰσότητα* (D.L. 8.10), which may be evidence of the community-living of a brotherhood. And Aristoxenus makes Pythagoras a pupil of Pherecydes, thus establishing a connection with an earlier holy man (D.L. 1.118).²

¹Aristoxenus is quoted as saying that beans were Pythagoras' favourite meal! (See Aul. Gell. NA 4.11; cf. D.L. 8.20). Again the sources are fragmentary and need careful handling. See the discussion of them by K. von Fritz, Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy and E. L. Minar, Early Pythagorean Politics in Practice and Theory (Baltimore, 1942). Also useful and informative are J. S. Morrison, "Pythagoras of Samos" CQ 1956 pp. 135ff.; G. J. de Vogel, Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism (Assen, 1966).

²For Pherecydes cf. also Diod. Sic. 10.3, 1-2; Pliny HN 2.81, 191.

Timon of Phlius, on the other hand, accused Pythagoras of practising magic (D.L. 8.36 = Fr. 580), a criticism probably of the popular tradition which at that time was transmitted only in small and obscure groups where the misunderstood mystico-religious doctrines were still observed.

The Roman legend before Philostratus

The *θεὸς ἀνὴρ*, though Pythagoras may not yet have been called by that name, re-emerges only in the Roman period with the revival of religious Pythagorism in the first century B.C. Again the sources for this renewed veneration of Pythagoras are fragmentary, existing only in citations of the third century A.D. compilers.¹

Before, however, the neo-Platonic Lives complete for us the portrait of Pythagoras as *θεὸς ἀνὴρ*, we should note briefly what sanctification he received in other disinterested Roman writers before Philostratus published the work which perhaps was to set the pattern for all future portraits of a *θεὸς ἀνὴρ*. Philostratus's conception of Apollonius will almost certainly have had some influence on Iamblichus's and Porphyry's conceptions of Pythagoras. If therefore we can discover the nature and extent of the veneration of Pythagoras in literature of the Roman period before Philostratus, a tentative conclusion may be reached on the contribution he made indirectly by his treatment of Apollonius to the biographical tradition on Pythagoras in its final form.

The conception of Pythagoras in non-philosophical writers of the Roman period was much the same as it had been in the Greek world.² Veneration as a god is twice attested by Diodorus Siculus. So great, he says, was the persuasive charm of Pythagoras' words that every day almost the whole population (of Croton) turned to him *ὡς περὶ πρὸς τινος θεοῦ παρουσίαν* (10.3, 2; cf. honours *ἴσα θεοῖς* in 10.9.9).

The Elder Pliny, relating Pherecydes' coniectio divina from a drink of well-water that there would be an earthquake, concludes:

¹Apollonius of Tyana is believed to have written a Life of Pythagoras. But its contents may not be known with any degree of certainty. Nicomachus, the other main source of this period, wrote books on arithmetic and geometry, but no biographical work has been claimed for him.

²For general accounts of the disciples see Diod. Sic. 10.3-11; Aul. Gell. NA 1.9, 1-7.

quae si vera sunt, quantum a deo tandem videri possunt tales (N.B. plural) distare dum vivunt (HN 2.81, 191-192). Contained in the plural tales will be an allusion to Pythagoras, who performed an identical miracle.

According to Ovid (Met. 15.62ff.), Pythagoras approached the gods in his thoughts, far removed from heaven though he was, and with the eyes of his mind feasted on those secrets which nature denied to human sight. His was, then, an inspired philosophy from the direct revelation of a god. And, though in the language of poetry, it is clear (ll.143ff.) that Pythagoras had the power to leave earth behind and travel aloft in the heavens in order to learn this divine lore—iuvat ire per alta astra...(ll. 147-149).

The θεῖος ἀνὴρ was an enigma. Some worshipped him, others scorned him. The ambiguity in the ancient testimonies for Pythagoras results partly from a misunderstanding by others of the uncompromising religious life and partly from the complete lack of toleration within the Pythagorean communities for those outside. Seneca's remark about Pythagorica illa invidiosa turbae schola (Q. Nat. 7.32, 2) denotes precisely that feeling of hostility from an excluded and therefore perhaps-resentful public. Plutarch also echoes the sentiments of a profanum vulgus when he says that Socrates took up philosophy which by Pythagoras and his followers had been abandoned to "phantoms, fables, and superstitions" (De Deo Socr. 9 = 580c).

Lucian in addition to the usual ridicule of various doctrines (silence, abstinence, transmigration) has Pythagoras disrespectfully called an ἀλαζων, γόης, and τερατουργός (Somn. 4). But one may see through his caricature of Pythagoras to the genuine, if misguided, devotion of those whom Lucian so contemptuously derided. In the Vit. Auct. the Pythagorean is called σεμνότατος (2),¹ and Hermes, the auctioneer, shouts out "who wants to be a superman (ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπους)"? The prospective buyer, after hearing the various doctrines of Pythagoras, confesses that he had never heard θειοτέρους λόγους... οὐδὲ μᾶλλον ἱερούς(4). And on seeing the golden thigh, he exclaims ὦ Ἡράκλεις, ... θεός, οὐ βροτός τις εἶναι φαίνεται (6).

¹cf. θεσπέσιος Πυθαγόρας in Lucian Pro laps. in sal. 5.

Philostratus's veneration of Pythagoras is just a continuation of the tradition, though in a more serious vein than Lucian. In the preface to his Life of Apollonius he testifies to the Pythagoras of Ovid: the man who associated (ξυνείναι) with gods and learnt from them how mankind meets their disapproval or wins their favour. Other men, he would say, use guess-work and reach contradictory conclusions about things divine, whereas Apollo had visited him in person, and other gods had conversed with him. His disciples thus honoured him as the messenger of Zeus (ὡς ἐκ Διὸς ἤκοντα), and many were the divine secrets they learnt from him (VA 1.1). Thus far Philostratus. He will say no more, for his subject is Apollonius, the new Pythagoras of the first century A.D. Perhaps no more needed to be said; the Pythagorean legend by this time may well have been complete. Only a glance at Porphyry and Iamblichus is now needed in order to fill the gaps in the attested tradition.

Porphyry and Iamblichus

The neo-Platonist Lives of Pythagoras¹ are more detailed than any other literary document in the tradition. The birth, early education under famous teachers, extensive travels among peoples renowned for wisdom, character and personality, teachings, powers, influence, opposition, and death of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ are treated in turn with an uninterrupted sense of awe and wonder. Some of their material has already been discussed and is of early origin; some of it is a later elaboration of that early tradition. Here we shall notice only what is completely new, and only what is vital to the category of θεῖος ἀνὴρ .

First, in Iamblichus and Porphyry the birth of Pythagoras is attended by wonderful events. Apollo, consulted about something else, prophesies to the father, Mnesarchus, birth of a son both beautiful and wise beyond all others and a blessing for all mankind (Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 5). Porphyry (Vit. Pyth. 10) gives a version

¹Porphyry (A.D. 232/3 - c. 305) probably wrote a general History of Philosophy down to Plato, of which the Life of Pythagoras is only one excerpt. (See Eunapius VS 454.) Iamblichus (c. A.D. 250 - c. 325), a pupil of Porphyry, wrote On the Pythagorean Life which, despite its title, is mainly a biographical account of Pythagoras' own life. For the general significance of their writings in the history of the concept of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ see below, ch. VIII pp. 235ff.

according to Antonius Diogenes (c. A.D. 100). Mnesarchus found the baby Pythagoras under a large and leafy poplar tree. Amazed at the miraculous way in which dew falling from the tree nourished the child, he took it into his arms considering its origin to be divine (*θείαν τινὰ... γένεσιν*).

The young Pythagoras was naturally handsome and like a god to behold (Iambl. 9). He is told by Thales that if he associated with the Egyptian priests he would become "the wisest and most divine (*θειότατος*) of all men" (Iambl. 12)¹. On the journey thither he sat still for two nights and three days without food, drink, or sleep, and the sailors recognized his superhuman quality by setting up a fruit-altar when they came to land, which Pythagoras later ate in order to replenish himself (Iambl. 15 ff.).

Further miraculous powers are assigned to him. He is said to have used a special food which banished hunger and thirst when he spent long periods in the sanctuaries of the gods (Porph. 34). The recipe for this food, according to Pythagoras, was given to Heracles by Demeter when he had been sent into the Libyan desert (*ibid.*). Presumably, it was a god who passed on the secret to Pythagoras. He used music and incantations in order to heal ailments of body and soul (Iambl. 65; Porph. 30, 33); at Tauromenium a youth was set free from a bad temper by an air on the flute (Iambl. 112). The power of physiognomy was used to read the characters of new disciples (Porph. 54; Iambl. 71).²

His authority was too great for its influence to extend only among his close followers. Porphyry tells how, according to Nicomachus, two thousand listeners after only one sermon no longer returned home but with their women and children built a school and received instructions from Pythagoras *ὡσαυτὲ θείας ὑποθήκας* (Porph. 20, cf. Iambl. 44 ff.).

Iamblichus alone mentions a dangerous ordeal in Sicily under the tyrant Phalaris which reads suspiciously like the experiences of Apollonius under Domitian (Iambl. 215-221, cf. Philostr. VA Books 7 and 8). Abaris visits Pythagoras in prison and is so

¹The word *θεῖος* is constantly used as an epithet in Iamblichus, less so in Porphyry.

²Physiognomy is attested also by Aul. Gell. NA 1.9, 1-2.

instructed that so far from seeing Pythagoras as a γόης (by implication the charge of Phalaris?) he admires him ὡς ἄν θεὸν ὑπερφυσίως (Iamb1. 216). Pythagoras is not worried by Phalaris' plans to kill him and he quotes the same Homeric line that Apollonius spoke to Domitian-- οὐ γὰρ με κτενέεις, ἔπει οὗτοι μόρσιμός ἐσσι (Iliad 22.13, cf. Philostr. VA 8.5). Eventually Phalaris is assassinated on the very day he had planned for the execution of Pythagoras and Abaris.¹

Finally, the miraculous reappears in the accounts of Pythagoras' end. According to one version, after opposition at Croton he was advised to flee. He reached Metapontum where having taken refuge in the temple of the Muses he remained alive for forty days without food or water (Porph. 56). A different version says that when the building he was staying in was set on fire, his devoted friends made a bridge with their bodies through the fire for him to escape in safety. Later in his solitude he took his own life (Porph. 57).²

There is more in these later Lives about the divine nature of Pythagoras' teaching, the organization of the religious brotherhood, the code of conduct, and so forth. They are important as the only surviving serious interpretations of the whole life of Pythagoras within the framework of the category of θεῖος ἀνὴρ.

The wider significance of Porphyry and Iamblichus for the concept of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ is more difficult to assess and will now form a conclusion to the discussion of Pythagoras. The theories of Rohde and Lévy that the neo-Platonists' works were no more than compilations of an essentially early tradition has only recently been questioned and certainly cannot be proved.³ Lévy's conclusion that Philostratus's Life of Apollonius conceals the legend of Pythagoras as portrayed by Apollonius himself is too subtle by half and overestimates the part

¹I. Lévy, La légende de Pythagore, pp. 52 ff., sees this episode as an early tradition (possibly going back to Heraclides Ponticus) conveyed by Apollonius of Tyana in his Life of Pythagoras and copied by Philostratus in his Life of Apollonius. The evidence, however, would suggest that Iamblichus was influenced by Philostratus.

²I. Lévy, op. cit., pp. 72ff., sees an ascension of Pythagoras concealed in Philostratus's Life of Apollonius. But there is not a single trace of this in either Iamblichus or Porphyry.

³I. Lévy, op. cit.; E. Rohde, Rhein. Mus. 26 (1871) and 27 (1872). For a more recent examination of Rohde's arguments see J. A. Philip, TAPA 90 (1959) pp. 185-94.

played by the Pythagorean legend in the ancient conception of the *Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. For Pythagoras was only one among many, and a generic element is to be expected in the various traditions on all who belonged to the common type.¹ Comparison is also very often one of general atmosphere and tone rather than of specific details. And as far as the only specific parallel is concerned, the Phalaris-episode in Iamblichus and the trial under Domitian in Philostratus, the omission of Iamblichus's version or any reference to it in all other sources would make it more than reasonable to suppose that he borrowed the ideas from Philostratus rather than Philostratus from Apollonius's Life of Pythagoras.

But if Porphyry and Iamblichus were merely the compilers of ancient sources with nothing to add on their own part by way of interpretation or extra detail, why the need for them to write at all? The evidence has shown that there was indeed no shortage of details on the divine legend of Pythagoras in earlier centuries, but the references are always scattered and seem to lack order and cohesion. There is no evidence that a full biographical interpretation of Pythagoras' life as a *Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* ever existed before the third century A.D.² Indeed from their chronological position in the general literature on the *Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* the Lives of Porphyry and Iamblichus may be seen very naturally as new and perhaps needed expositions of the ancient Pythagorean tradition. For the first two centuries A.D. saw a glut of *Θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι*, real and imaginary, earnest and fraudulent. The life of one of them, Apollonius of Tyana, was believed by Philostratus to hold the key to an understanding of the divine nature of the general type about whom in the past it had become customary to suspend judgement. This inevitably brought about new interest in an earlier *Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* who was in many respects the spiritual ancestor of Apollonius. A fuller interpretation of his life was now possible in the light of the recent interest in the general category which he represented. This, then, was the brief of Porphyry and Iamblichus and this is how I

¹See E. M. Butler, The Myth of the Magus, pp. 47f.

²Apollonius's Life of Pythagoras may have been no more biographical than the later Lives of Plato (Apuleius, Olympiodorus, the anonymous Life)—the main concern of which was to present the doctrine with only an introductory section on the life of the philosopher. This seems to be the case with the writings of Nicomachus about Pythagoras and his thought.

understand the evidence for the Pythagorean tradition.¹

The Problem of Socrates and the History of Legend

Perhaps the earliest statement of the Socratic problem, even though unintentionally, comes from Plato himself when in Theaetetus 149a Socrates, quoting popular opinion, is made to say, "I am a most bewildering man who goes about making people perplexed". Both to his contemporaries and to succeeding generations Socrates was something of a mystery. This accounts for the great diversity in the evidence even of immediate sources, which in turn results in an extreme variety of modern views.² Socrates was all things to all men. To Antisthenes and Aeschines he was a Cynic, to Aristotle the precursor of conceptualism, and to Xenophon among other things an expert on estate management. To Plato he was at different times rationalist, moralist, political theorist, visionary and mystic. The question has been asked how far these conflicting views represent a historical Socrates and how far they are no more than a set of interpretations representing a "theoretically possible" Socrates.³

In order to deal with these "constructions of history" a two-fold analysis of the evidence is necessary. First, the information available to each author must be assessed together with the opportunity each had of knowing Socrates directly or indirectly. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, account must be taken of the author's motive in writing about Socrates, his interest in specific aspects of Socrates' complex character, and his friendly or hostile disposition

¹A comparison of Porphyry and Iamblichus with Diogenes Laertius will show clearly the contrast between dispassionate compilation and almost evangelistic fervour. The fervour, of course, may not have lasted long in either case.

²The literature on the Socratic problem is vast. An extensive survey of interpretations and solutions is given by V. de Magalhaes-Vilhena, Le Problème de Socrate: le Socrate historique et le Socrate de Platon (Paris, 1952) and Socrate et la légende platonicienne (Paris, 1952). Cf. the review of this important work by C. J. de Vogel, "The Present State of the Socratic Problem" Phronesis 1 (1955), pp. 26 ff. See also A. E. Taylor, Varia Socratica (Oxford, 1911); G. C. Field, Plato and his Contemporaries (London, 1930); A. K. Rogers, The Socratic Problem (New York, 1933); A. H. Chroust, Socrates, Man and Myth (London, 1957).

³V. de Magalhaes-Vilhena, Le Problème de Socrate, p. 103. This same author sees the problem of Socrates as the problem of history in general: it is the problem of the possibility of objective knowledge (op. cit., p. 98, cf. p. 105).

towards him. There was, for example, an ancient tradition that Socrates made no defence at his trial (Appian 11.7, 41; Maximus of Tyre 3.1ff.; Philostr. VA 4.46). This could mean that the Apologies of Plato and Xenophon, like that of Libanius in the fourth century A.D., were unhistorical apologetic. Although it is generally thought that Plato, who says he was present, is giving a reasonably authentic account, one can never know decisively about this or many other notorious difficulties on the Socratic tradition. Our knowledge is itself a matter of Socratic irony: we know only that we know nothing.

But one thing common to so many of the ancient sources is that Socrates seems to have created with them the impression of a man who had combined a strong intellect with out-of-the-world dimensions. This places him in line with Pythagoras and Empedocles as an early predecessor of the type later known as *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. This quality is recognized to a greater or lesser degree both in sources of great antiquity and in the scattered anecdotes and opinions of later writers.¹

Socratic dialogues were probably written before those of Plato.² Diogenes Laertius (2.64) gives six names: Plato, Xenophon, Antisthenes, Aeschines, Phaedo and Euclides. He hints that there were others. We could add, if we knew their names, the authors of the pseudo-Platonic dialogues. However, little remains of this literature apart from Plato and Xenophon. And Aristotle, writing for readers who already knew a great deal about Socrates, gives a brief and colourless portrait which tells us nothing about the personality of Socrates that we do not know from Plato.

Xenophon, who was not in a good position to write about Socrates from first-hand experience, is so concerned to answer the attacks of Polycrates' polemic that he leaves us the rather dull picture of a patriotic, pious, and just citizen who could never have harmed state

¹The sources (in English) have recently been systematically compiled by J. Ferguson, Socrates: a Source Book (London, 1970).

²Aristotle says that Alexamenus of Teos was the first to compose in this genre (Fr. 72). Diogenes Laertius (2.122, 124) suggests that Simon the Cobbler may have been the first, for when Socrates came into his workshop he used to make notes of all that he could remember. For a discussion of this literature see V. de Magalhaes-Vilhena, op. cit., pp. 321-53 and Socrate et la légende platonicienne, pp. 62-96.

or individual during his lifetime. As J. B. Bury has put it, "in his endeavour to show that Socrates was a good man he succeeds in concealing the fact that he was a great man".¹ But his apologetic tendencies may excuse him only up to a point. He appears to have had little flair for composing an idealized portrait of a philosopher and soon loses interest in Socrates who eventually discusses in the dialogues topics which were of interest only to Xenophon himself. Only occasionally does the superhuman dimension of Socrates display itself.

Plato was in a far stronger position to be able to record the life and thought of the historical Socrates than any other witness whose writings have survived. Only from his dialogues is there any real hope of understanding in detail what the real Socrates was like. Whatever conclusion is reached about the philosophical thought of Socrates, we may be justified in an expectation that biographical detail and the delineation of his character and personality are in the main trustworthy. Even in the Phaedo, where the doctrine of the soul may be Plato's, the dramatic portrait is of Socrates not of Plato himself!² Certainly Plato idealizes the historical Socrates, but that does not mean his portrait is a falsification. In fact his admiration for Socrates probably guarantees a certain degree of fidelity; for he is hardly likely to invent a fictitious Socrates if the real one caused such devotion. At all events, it is Plato who preserves the tradition of Socrates the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, the man whom the Pythian god had designated as wisest in all Greece, the man who in obedience to that god dedicated his extraordinary life to a mission in which he was to lead mankind to care for their souls.

One important source has not been mentioned. The earliest interpretation of Socrates belongs to Aristophanes the comic poet. He knew and was known to Socrates,³ and the Clouds was written for

¹J. B. Bury, "The Age of Illumination," ch. 13 in The Cambridge Ancient History vol. V (1927), p. 386.

²For ancient opinion on the authenticity of Plato's Socrates see J. Ferguson, op. cit., p. 3 and the references cited there.

³He speaks in the Symposium (189 ff.), which is believed to have taken place after the date of the Clouds in the last decade of the fifth century.

an audience which would be well acquainted with the daily activities of this uncanny Athenian. Of course, comedy is no nearer biography than is either dramatic dialogue or romance, and Aristophanes, like Plato and Xenophon, has something more than the life of Socrates as his purpose. He wants above all to cause laughter and win the first prize. He must therefore distort persons and things in order to make them look ridiculous. But he will not give a total misrepresentation of the facts. Just as Plato's idealization will not be too far removed from the historical truth without its motives losing all justification, so Aristophanes' caricature will have some basis in historical truth (or at least what people believed to be true of Socrates) in order that it may succeed as caricature.

From these sources and the briefer testimonies of later writers a hagiography of Socrates, though perhaps not on the same scale as that of Pythagoras, may be traced in the ancient world.

Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος in the Socratic Tradition

It must be remembered that Socrates belonged to a later and more sophisticated age and could not expect to be treated with precisely the same sense of wonder as seems to have accompanied Pythagoras. There is no doubt, however, that he belonged to the same class of beings, combining a psychic personality with the strong conviction of a religious mission. But in his case an oral legend had no chance to grow or acquire the enhancement and elaboration of those features which, true or false, later came to be expected of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. A literary tradition had already been started in his own lifetime by the comedians and was continued immediately after his death by serious admirers.¹

Divine Recognition

Socrates was revered by his close band of followers and acclaimed by many famous intellectuals of his day (Prot. 361c; Parm. 130a, 135d;

¹The absence of an oral legend distinguishes Socrates from Pythagoras and Apollonius, as the absence of disciples distinguishes Empedocles and Apollonius from Pythagoras and Socrates. The hagiography of Socrates lacked the more miraculous elements. Empedocles lacked only a more detailed hagiography at the hands of personal followers. Philostratus was to fill this last need for Apollonius.

D.L. 2.25, 29, 48, 60, 65, 105, 121; 6.2).¹ The clearest recognition of his superhuman qualities is attributed by Plato to Alcibiades (Symp. 215a - 217a). Not one of his fellow banqueters, he claims, is aware of the real nature of Socrates. He compares his notoriously grotesque features to some novel statuettes of Silenus which when opened contain images of the gods. Anyone who opens Socrates will find within that coarse exterior wondrous temperance and wisdom (216). The "divine images" which Alcibiades claims to have seen inside Socrates are "so supremely beautiful, so golden, so divine, and wonderful, that everything which Socrates commands surely ought to be obeyed, even like the voice of a god" (216e).² In the same speech Alcibiades confesses that Socrates differs from the satyr Marsyas (who challenged Apollo in flute-playing) only in needing no instrument to charm men's minds. His words alone amaze and possess the souls of man, woman and child who comes within hearing distance' (215d). He was the only man who had ever made Alcibiades feel ashamed in his presence. Often had he wished him dead; but were that so, he would be even more distressed, and in fact he knew not what to make of him (216c). In a similar, but perhaps begrudging, appraisal Meno considers himself bewitched-by-Socrates and reduced-to-silence. He also believes that if ever Socrates went abroad and acted in this manner he would be taken for a γόης (Meno 80a-c).³

J. Ferguson quotes in English an extract from an anonymous dramatist of the fourth century who in referring to the later execution of Meletus calls him "the wretch who doomed double-natured Socrates".⁴

¹The settings of the Parmenides and Protagoras are physically possible, even if the content of what Socrates says in them is doubtful.

²Schol. on Ar. Clouds 223 says that Socrates used to compare his appearance to Silenus. For Silenus as a type of the wisdom concealed beneath an uncouth exterior see Virgil Ecl. 6. In Symp. 222a the words of Socrates are called θεϊότατοι and in 219c he is δαιμόνιος ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ θουμαστός.

³A tradition of wizardry can be seen for Socrates. Cf. Timon of Phlius in Clem. Alex. Strom. 1.14 and D.L. 2.19 (ἐπαοιδός).

⁴J. Ferguson, op. cit., p. 173 (Anon. 386E).

If this fragment is dated correctly, it becomes an important testimony of the equivocal status of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* among his contemporaries as a man partly human and partly divine. One may see from the ridicule in the Clouds that Socrates did have a high opinion of himself or was rated highly by others. Suspended in a basket in mid-air he looks down from the sky like a god and pretentiously addresses Strepsiades ὦ 'φήμερε (mortal, creature of a day l. 223).

Divine mission

The critical point in Socrates' career came when the Delphic Oracle replied to a question of his disciple Chaerephon that there was none wiser than he (Apol. 21a).¹ Only a long-established reputation as a *σοφός* could make such a response possible. But from that moment Socrates saw his life as closely related to the god and to be spent in some sort of divine mission. The story is well known how at first he sought to refute the oracle but after a lengthy investigation was forced to conclude that the god had pronounced him wisest because he alone knew that his wisdom was worth nothing. It then becomes a divine service for him to vindicate the oracle at every opportunity, and he says that he gave up his whole life to this mission, even though it resulted in poverty and the neglect of his own affairs (Ap. 23b). Such a divine gift, he says, is not likely to come to Athens again (Ap. 31a).²

Strict obedience to the god is a prominent theme in the Platonic tradition (Ap. 29d, 30a, 33c, 35d, 37e; Crito 43d, 54e; Phaedo 60e - 61b; Theaet. 150c; 1 Alc. 106a, etc.), though it is not always clear whether it is Apollo or Socrates' *δαίμωνιον* who has to be obeyed. As a result of this oracle and his obedience to it Socrates gains the reputation of being under the providential care of the gods. He is convinced that no evil can happen to a good man in life or after death and that the gods do not neglect his affairs (Ap. 41d; Phaedo 62b).

¹The oracle forms an important part of the tradition and figures largely in no less than fifteen sources later than Plato. (See Ferguson's Source Book.) It is generally dated sometime before the Peloponnesian War (in Charm. 153a Socrates resumes his mission after the siege of Potidaea).

²For this divine mission in later tradition see Plutarch Alc. 4.1, 193; Maximus of Tyre 38.7.

Nor is it god's will (οὐ θεμιτόν) for a bad man to harm one better than himself (Ap. 30d). Xenophon at the conclusion to his Apology says that Socrates obtained only that fate which the gods decree to those they most love (θεοφιλοῦς μοίρας - 32). Later writers call him θεοφιλήs (Aelian 2.13; Epiphanius Scholasticus 7.2, 10; Petronius Satyricon 140¹).

Superhuman powers

The oracle ensured that Socrates was regarded as one endowed with superhuman wisdom.² He certainly possessed superhuman powers. First, there was his divine sign, or voice, the δαιμόνιον which he claims to have experienced from early childhood (Pl. Ap. 31d; Xen. Mem. 1.1, 2-4 etc.). This was something "not human" (οὐκ ἀνθρώπειον - I Alc. 103a) and is sometimes even called θεός (I Alc. 105d e, 124c).³ It is not perfectly clear what the δαιμόνιον did or how it functioned. Plato maintains that it always dissuaded or held Socrates back.⁴ According to Xenophon, it gave both positive and negative advice, not only helping Socrates to foresee the future but guiding his friends also.⁵ Its precise nature is not known. It was certainly not a conscience, for it gives advice on all manner of non-ethical things. Nor was it, to Socrates at least, a guardian spirit (δαιμόνιον not δαίμων/genius). It was something in the sub-conscious which shows that Socrates possessed the temperament of a psychic visionary. Plutarch, who along with Apuleius discusses its nature, sees it as a sort of sixth sense which perceived sounds of a

¹Petronius ibid. has deorum hominumque (? decus/amicus).

²See Socrates Scholasticus 3.23; Epiphanius Scholasticus 7.2, 10. Valerius Maximus (7.2, ext. 1) calls Socrates "a kind of earthly oracle of human wisdom".

³The authenticity of I Alcibiades is hotly disputed. At all events, Plato does use the words σημεῖον (Euthyd. 272e), φωνή (Phaedrus 242b), and δαιμόνιον (Ap. et passim) in order to describe this power.

⁴Plato's view is supported by Cicero Div. 1.54, 122-24; Maximus of Tyre 8.1 - 8; Apuleius De deo Socr.; Aelian VH 8.1.

⁵Xenophon is supported by Plutarch De gen. Socr. 580-81, Nicias 13.6, 532; D.L. 2.32; Minucius Felix Oct. 26.9.

higher nature susceptible only to *θείους καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἀνδράσιν* (De gen. Socr. 589).

Again, from time to time Socrates fell into trances. They were a common occurrence and are parodied by Aristophanes in Clouds 170 ff. Usually the trance lasted only a short time like the one which caused him to miss part of the dinner in the Symposium (174d). But the most famous occasion was in the camp outside the walls of Potidaea, where Socrates became transported from one sunrise to the next *φροντίξων τε*. Some of the soldiers moved their bedding around him, as it was a warm night, and watched how long he would persist (Symp. 220c - d). Aulus Gellius in a general comment on this power of mental dissociation says that Socrates would stand perfectly still "as if his intellect and spirit had migrated from his body" (NA 2.1).

He also claimed to have prophetic dreams in which he could discover the will of god (Pl. Ap. 33c; Phaedo 60 - 61). He had been warned in a dream two days earlier of the exact day of his departure from life (Crito 44a). Through the gift of Apollo he could also prophesy without the aid of dreams (Phaedo 85b); though later writers say that it was his *δαίμόνιον* that enabled him to see things hidden from the rest of mankind.¹ Most famous are his predictions on the point of death to Anytus about his dissolute son (Xen. Ap. 29) and to the Athenians who condemned him about others who after him will come to cross-examine and harass them (Pl. Ap. 39c). The later Platonic legend records a dream which Socrates had on the night before Plato became his pupil. It was of a swan (sacred to Apollo) flying into his lap (Pausanias 1.30, 3; Origen c. Celsum 6.8; D.L. 3.5; cf. the late Lives of Plato).² Finally, according to the Suda (s.v.), Socrates after his death appeared in a dream to a disciple who had come too late to see him!

There is abundant evidence to show that Socrates (sometimes) practised asceticism. His indifference towards food and drink, clothing, and a generally respectable appearance is held up to

¹D.L. 2.32; Plutarch Nicias 13.6, 532 (the disastrous Sicilian expedition); De gen. Socr. 580 (a case of extra-sensory perception). Cf. Xen. Mem. 1.1, 5; 4.7, 10.

²This dream is parodied in Athenaeus 11.507c.

ridicule by Aristophanes (e.g. Clouds 412 ff., 834 ff.; Birds 1280 ff., 1554 ff., cf. D.L. 2.28). These privations together with his amazing endurance of extreme weather conditions and other hardships serve only to glorify the Socrates of Plato and Xenophon (Pl. Symp. 220b; Xen. Mem. 1.2, 1). But on occasions he could spruce himself up for dinner (Pl. Symp. 174a) and drink all his friends under the table and himself stay sober (ibid. 176c, 214a, 220a). It was his mastery over bodily needs which helped Socrates alone to resist from the outset the plague of 430 B.C. (Aelian VH 13.27; Aul. Gell. NA 2.1; D.L. 2.25). Xenophon records the following saying of Socrates: "I believe it divine (θεῖον) to want nothing, almost divine to want least" (Mem. 1.6, 10).¹ Alcibiades also praises his extraordinary courage in the army and his humility in not accepting the prize for valour (Pl. Symp. 220-221; cf. Laches 180d).

Teachings

It is equally difficult to derive with any degree of exactitude from either Socrates or Pythagoras the doctrines of their disciples. And here is not the place to argue what Socrates taught and what Plato says he taught. However, it seems certain enough that Socrates no less than Pythagoras held and taught beliefs of a more than usually mystical nature. His semi-religious conception of himself as the midwife of other people's thought (Theaet. 149 - 151; Clouds 137) would support Aristotle's assertion² that Socrates identified virtue with knowledge and therefore wrongdoing with ignorance: his method of correction was by conversation to help each man think out for himself the error of his ways. A mystical doctrine of "recollection" (possibly adapted from Orphic and Pythagorean ideas on pre-existence and immortality)³ is also in harmony with his maieutic vocation.

It has been maintained in the past that a spiritual theory of Forms, however imperfect, is not an impossible step from Socrates'

¹Cf. D.L. 2.27 and 34.

²Aristotle Eth. Nic. 213, 1144b 28-30; Eth. Eud. A5, 1216b 3 - 9; Mag. Mor. A1, 1128a 15 - 23, etc.

³See A. E. Taylor, Plato: The Man and his Work (3rd ed. London, 1929), p. 186 n.2.

undisputed quest for universal definitions.¹ But even if Aristotle is correct in denying that Socrates took such a step (Metaph. 13, 4, 1078b 17 - 32), it is almost certain that he believed in another world of infinitely greater importance than the one which derided and persecuted him (Pl. Ap. 41; Phaedo 63bc, 69 cd). This is more closely connected with his ideas on the soul's immortality. Few would deny that "care of the soul" was for Socrates the positive side to his negative mission of proving the worthlessness of worldly wisdom. It is otherwise difficult to explain the significance of Aristophanes' jokes about the ψυχῶν σοφῶν . . . φροντιστήριον (Clouds 94) and the reference to Socrates evoking the soul of a soulless man (Birds 1554 ff).² It could, I think, be claimed that the ridicule in the Clouds is rather of a genuine mystic to whom the more detestable aspects of sophistry are improperly but humorously attached than of a sophist-scientist whose portrait is distorted by the introduction of unwanted mystico-religious elements.³ But even if the idea of Socrates in charge of a religious brotherhood is an exaggeration,⁴ the mystical cultivation of the soul is attested for him in both Plato and Xenophon (Pl. Ap. 29de, 36c, 41c; Phaedo 64e, 114e; Laches 185d; Gorgias 486d, 513d; Protag. 313a - 314b, cf. 310 - 312; Xen. Mem. 1.2, 4 - 5; 1.4, 9; 1.5, 4 - 6). Such a preoccupation would

¹J. Burnet, Plato's Phaedo (Oxford, 1911), A. E. Taylor, Varia Socratica, and A. K. Rogers, The Socratic Problem, all would ascribe at least some part of Plato's Theory of Forms to Socrates. The Pythagorean doctrine of Number offers, perhaps, not an inappropriate parallel. Though generally regarded as the product of developed Pythagoreanism, this too may have been prompted by some preliminary inquiry of Pythagoras himself.

²Cf. Strepsiades' fear of becoming ἡμεθνής (Clouds 504). Clearly to Aristophanes' audience the ψυχή was no more than a ghost.

³It all depends on the significance to be ascribed to Plato's assertions in the Phaedo (96ab) that Socrates "dabbled" in scientific inquiry and in the Apology (19cd, 18b, 23d) that he had nothing whatsoever to do with this. Xenophon (Mem. 4.7, 1 ff.) tends to support the passages in the Apology.

⁴Certainly the Socrates of the Clouds is nearer to the leader of a Pythagorean community than to a materially minded sophist. This, of course, does not guarantee authenticity. Aristophanes is using Socrates as a portmanteau figure, so to speak, on which he can hang all the traits of groups or individuals in society whom he wishes to attack.

naturally seem strange to the uninitiated majority who were unacquainted with or suspicious of similar Orphic and Pythagorean beliefs. And it was this that made Socrates appear eccentric to the scoffer but a truly inspired visionary to the devotee.

Death and influence

Socrates was not only misunderstood by comic poets, he was also feared by politicians. In his conduct at and after his trial he displayed an absolute consistency in standing by his principles. This alone marked him out as being exceptional to his disciples. But his composure and peace of mind in the condemned cell and his hope that death was for him the better state even if the truth was "unknown to all save god" revealed a confidence hitherto beyond human conception and a courage which in the eyes of contemporaries had its source and origin in the divine.¹

According to Diogenes Laertius (2.43), the Athenians immediately repented after Socrates' death. As a sign of mourning the gymnasia and palaestrae were closed; Meletus was condemned to death, the other prosecutors were exiled; and a bronze statue was set up to Socrates (cf. Diod. Sic. 14.37, 7; Origen c. Celsum 1.3; Tertullian Ad Nat. 1.10, 42).

The influence of Socrates was enormous. He founded no school, but many philosophers of different schools claimed allegiance to him. If some Christian writers criticized him as a typical embodiment of paganism, others saw him as a man of genuine wisdom groping in a world of darkness towards the true enlightenment, the perfect example of an anima naturaliter Christiana.² Just as Pythagoras' legend set an important precedent for the later worship of Apollonius of Tyana and men like him, the early hagiography of Socrates was the precedent for some sanctification in school writings of many wise

¹See the Apology, Crito and Phaedo in general and especially Ap. 37e, 39ab, 42; Crito 43b; Phaedo 58e, 59a (referring to Socrates' θεῖα μοῖρα), 63bc.

²W. Jaeger, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture E.T. by G. Highet (3 vols. Oxford, 1943-45), II p. 14. See also V. de Magalhaes-Vilhena, Socrate et la légende platonicienne, pp. 39 - 57. The parallel of Socrates and Christ has been drawn by Th. Deman, Socrate et Jesus (Paris, 1944). Cf. Magalhaes-Vilhena, Le Problème de Socrate, pp. 49, 305 and notes.

men who came after him such as Diogenes, Democritus, Zeno, and Epicurus.¹ But no Greek philosopher who came after Socrates was recognized as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* in precisely the same full sense. To this extent, perhaps, the partial hagiographies of later schools were no more than imitations of the genuine worship of their first philosopher-saint.

¹See below, ch. IV, pp. 91f.

CHAPTER III

DIVINE HONOURS FOR CONQUERORS AND KINGS

In the preceding chapters an early concept of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* has been worked out for the archaic and classical ages of the Greek world. There are two main requirements that such a person must satisfy. First, he will need to have made obvious to others, if not also to have claimed, a superiority in various forms over other men. Secondly, this superiority should be matched with a feeling of obligation to the rest of the world in respect of the knowledge, powers, or achievements by which he is superior; that is to say, his life on earth will take the form of a divine mission conferring benefits, both material and spiritual, on mankind. A man who is *θεῖος* only in respect of, for example, his eminence as a poet or simply because he is a hero or king (thereby of divine origin) does not enter into the study. Our concern is with the man who is a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* because nothing else about him, either in his character or in his status, can possibly explain the kind of life he lived and its effect on other people.

In its fullest sense, then, the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* is a religious concept. Consequently it may be thought to have little to do with the phenomenon of ruler-worship. For the most part this is true. The divine origin of the king may have been important in Egypt, but the fact that Spartan or Athenian kings could trace their ancestry back to certain gods was never made the basis for honours or worship on a scale comparable to those received by the Pharaohs. But there is evidence that for some rulers and emperors the rendering of customary divine honours was something more than a political formality. To a certain degree these cases become relevant to this study in that they

show a variation of the religious conception of men as gods in a non-religious sphere.

One early ruler recognized as a deliverer sent by god was Cyrus the elder. The Jews believed in him as an agent of Yahweh (Isaiah 41. 2-4; 44.28; 45.1-3, 13; cf. Ezra 1.1-4; 2 Chron. 36.22-23). He may even have claimed to be such a one. In the famous Cylinder of Cyrus (inscription of propaganda written on a clay barrel) issued to the Babylonians after his conquest of that city in 538 B.C. he attributed his victory to the favour of the Babylonian god Bel-Marduk, who "going at his side like a real friend" had chosen him to overthrow the evil rule of Nabonidus and to become "ruler of the world".¹

But Cyrus was an oriental and recognition by the Greek world of his superior qualities comes only in the fourth century with Xenophon's idealistic portrait of a king in the Cyropaedia.² The first and by far the most important case of a Greek ruler who may have believed his life to be superior to that of other men was Alexander of Macedon, main-spring of the later formalistic worship of Hellenistic kings.

Alexander the Great

Alexander is as complex a historical figure as either Socrates or Pythagoras. The literature on him began with the official records of his journeys and his own court-historians, nothing of which has survived.³ The extant authorities of some three or four hundred years later give two contradictory pictures, one of a megalomaniac,

¹This earthen document now in the British Museum was first published by H. Rawlinson in Journ. of Royal Asiat. Soc. 12 (1880). See also J. B. Pritchard ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (Princeton, 1955), pp. 315f.

²On Xenophon's Cyrus see below, ch. IV, p. 83f.

³A journal was kept by Eumenes, a log of voyages by Nearchus, geographical reports were made by Baeton and Diognetus, the "official" history was recorded by Callisthenes, Onesicritus, Cleitarchus and others. Ptolemy I and Aristobulus are singled out by Arrian as most trustworthy. On the sources see W. W. Tarn, Alexander the Great (2 vols. Cambridge, 1948) II; L. Pearson, The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great (New York, 1960).

the other of a king and gentleman of "heroic" stature.¹ An altogether separate source is formed by the romantic literature which gathered around Alexander from at least the second century B.C. It is to this that Alexander owed world-wide fame, for the romance gained such immense popularity in the medieval ages that it finally took on over eighty versions in twenty-four languages from the peoples of the East Indies to Ireland and the Atlantic.² In the course of this legend Alexander and his wanderings acquire many sensational and extravagant features which were products of later imagination. It was not until the revival of classical scholarship in the Renaissance that romance gave way at last to the historical traditions.

However, even the historical Alexander by means of his conquests, his personality and, of course, his own omnipotence prompted a comparison with the gods. There are three critical stages in his career which show a progressive confidence on the young king's part in his divine qualities. There are the journey of pilgrimage to the oracle of Ammon at Siwah in the Egyptian desert (331 B.C.), the tentative introduction of the Persian custom of *προσκύνησις* in his court at Bactria (327 B.C.), and the probable demand and attested concession of divine honours from Greek city-states in 324 B.C. Discussion of Alexander will pivot upon these three points which are now taken up one by one.³

Ammon: in the steps of demi-gods

According to Arrian, a longing came upon Alexander (*πόθος λαμβάνει*)⁴

¹These are Plutarch, Arrian, Diodorus Siculus and Curtius. Cf. also the ridicule in Lucian Dial. Mort. and the hostile tradition in Justin's Epitome of Trogus.

²See E. H. Haight, More Essays on the Greek Romances (New York, 1945); G. Cary, The Medieval Alexander ed. D. J. A. Ross (Cambridge, 1956).

³A collection of important articles on Alexander appears in G. T. Griffith ed., Alexander the Great: The Main Problems (Cambridge, 1965), where see in particular J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "The Divinity of Alexander" (also in Historia 1, 1950, pp. 363-88).

⁴Possibly a dictum of Alexander; and if so, an expression which confirms his mystic temperament. See Agnes Savill, Alexander the Great and His Time (London, 1955), p. 227; cf. V. Ehrenberg, Alexander and the Greeks (Oxford, 1938) pp. 74-83. On the motives of the journey to Ammon's shrine see also J. R. Hamilton, Plutarch Alexander: A Commentary (Oxford, 1969) pp. 68-70.

to visit and consult the oracle which his ancestors, Perseus and Heracles, had consulted before him. He felt a certain amount of rivalry with these two heroes and it was in order to learn more accurately about himself that he set out (Arr. Anab. 3.3, 1f).¹ The journey across the desert becomes a pilgrimage during which the divine assistance received was, in Plutarch's estimation, more creditable than the oracles delivered at the end of it (Plut. Alex. 26). Heavy showers of rain continually satisfied their thirst, and when a sand-storm had caused the party to lose its way, two ravens (or talking serpents) guided the column (Arr. Anab. 3.3, - 4.5; Plut. Alex. 26).

When Alexander arrived, he heard what he wanted and then went away (Arr. Anab. 3.4, 5). Later he disclosed that the oracle had informed him of "the gods to whom he should sacrifice" (ibid. 6.19, 4). But Plutarch says that in a letter to his mother Alexander writes that she alone may learn the nature of the god's response (Alex. 27). Perhaps Alexander was trying to create an aura of mystery about his person. Alternatively, something may in fact have been divulged to him which convinced him that he was different from other men. Plutarch does say that outside the shrine the priest greeted the king on the god's behalf $\delta\varsigma \alpha\pi\omicron \pi\alpha\tau\rho\varsigma$ (Alex. 27). And Strabo, quoting Callisthenes, states the greeting more precisely as $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (17.1, 43). This reception may have been no more than a formality to Alexander, who as ruling Pharaoh of the Egyptians was son of Ammon-Re. But it is treated by the historians, if not by the king himself, as a turning-point in his career. Callisthenes in addition to relating the priest's words declares that the oracle at Didyma after years of silence had proclaimed Alexander son of Zeus and that this was confirmed by a prophetess of Erythrae (Strabo 17.1, 43). This gave rise, no doubt, to the story in the romance of Ps.-Callisthenes that Nectanebus, king of Egypt, in the form of a serpent seduced Olympias and convinced her that she was to bear the child of a god.²

¹With hindsight Arrian also says that Alexander believed himself to be descended in part from Ammon as Perseus and Heracles were from Zeus.

²Ps.-Callisthenes 1.1, 4-5; cf. Plut. Alex. 2; Cic. Div. 2.135; Lucian Alex. 7.

It may be more correct to view the Ammon episode within the wider context of Alexander's emulation of the deeds of Heracles and Dionysus. After all, it was superhuman exploits which elevated men like Heracles into the divine sphere; and Dionysus, though born a god, proved his divinity by amazing feats upon earth. Alexander's journey to Siwah (in imitation of Heracles) not only gave solemnity to his undertakings but also encouraged the soldiers to view as extraordinary his outstanding achievements.¹ Curtius tells us that Alexander's first son by Barsine was named Heracles (10.6, 11; cf. Pausanias 9.7, 2). Altars in honour of the twelve gods at the farthest limits of eastern India are set up μιμούμενος τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὸν Διονύσου (Strabo 3.5, 5; cf. Diodorus 17.95; Arr. Anab. 5.29, 1-2).² At Nysa Alexander was delighted to hear that he would be journeying further than Dionysus (Arr. Anab. 5.1, 5 - 2, 1). Moreover, an Athenian decree may even have given him the name Dionysus (see D.L. 6.63). Towards the end of his life when he learnt that the Arabs worshipped only two gods, Dionysus and Zeus, he considered that he also would be worshipped by them as a third god "since his achievements were not inferior to those of Dionysus" (Arr. Anab. 7.19, 6; cf. Strabo 16.1, 11).³

Alexander is certainly believed to be under the protection of the gods. Long before the miracles in the desert a timely shifting of the winds at the foot of Mt. Climax in Pamphylia saved the army from being swept away with the tide, a deliverance which the king and his retinue considered to be οὐκ ἄνευ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Arr. Anab. 1.26, 2; cf. Strabo 14.3, 9; Plut. Alex. 17). Thunder and lightning in the night that followed the cutting of the Gordian knot was a sign of divine approval (Arr. Anab. 2.3, 1f.). When Alexander in battle against Darius prayed, "if I am truly sprung from Zeus, defend and strengthen the Greeks", a favourable omen appeared in the form of an eagle soaring above his head (Plut. Alex. 33, according to Callisthenes).

¹For this aspect of Alexander's religious conscience see H. Berve, Das Alexanderreich aus prosopographischer Grundlage (2 vols. Munich, 1926) I pp. 92ff.

²The inscription begins "To father Ammon and brother Heracles etc." (Philostr. VA 2.43). Cf. Alexander's answer to Diogenes (Plut. De Alex. fort. 1.10, 332b) Ἡρακλέα μιμούμαι καὶ Περσέα ἤλω, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Διονύσου μέγαν ἔχνη κτλ.

³L. Pearson, op. cit., p. 184, notes that Arrian calls this a λόγος (i.e. we do not have to believe it). But this may be only because neither Ptolemy nor Aristobulus mention it.

Now it is possible that many of these details are due to the flattery of court-historians. But it is improbable that Alexander would have allowed such interpretations of his achievements unless he also approved or even encouraged them. One thing is certain: his deeds surpassed all previous human exploits. Whether or not his peculiarly Egyptian relationship to a god caused Alexander to ponder secretly over his own claim to be no less worthy of divine honours than Heracles or Dionysus, it seems to have fired the imagination of those who later wrote about him.

Oriental designs: προσκύνησις

Four years after the visit to Ammon there are signs that the east was going to Alexander's head. As early as 330 B.C. he had adopted Persian dress. This together with the adoption of the historian Chares as chamberlain and other minor customs were reluctantly tolerated by an admiring camp (Arr. Anab. 4.7, 4; Plut. Alex. 45). His rivalry of the demi-gods continued and many, no doubt, were prepared to consider him their equal. But the attempt to introduce the oriental custom of obeisance (προσκύνησις) in 327 B.C. was quite different. Though only a formal ceremony to the Persians, this had always implied worship of a god to the Greeks.¹ It was one thing to regard Alexander as the equal of Heracles or Dionysus—his achievements were proof of that. It was another to worship him as a god in his own lifetime. The revulsion of the Greeks is typified by the perhaps unexpected refusal of Callisthenes to acquiesce in the ceremony.²

The purpose of the προσκύνησις for Alexander remains a debated question. I cannot agree with Balsdon and Wilcken that he simply desired to express the equal position of Persians with the Macedonians

¹On the nature of προσκύνησις see M. P. Charlesworth, "Some Observations on Ruler-cult", Harv. Theol. Rev. 28 (1935) pp. 17ff.; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, op. cit., pp. 371ff. For Greek opposition to the custom cf. Xen. Anab. 3.2, 13; Hdt. 7.136; Nepos Conon 3.3f.; Plut. Artax. 22.8.

²Arrian (Anab. 4.11, 7) summarizes Callisthenes' views: "Even Heracles never received divine honours in his lifetime, nor after his death until the Delphic Oracle had proclaimed him a god. The time to deify Alexander is after his death". There were in fact two versions of the introduction of the ceremony. See Arr. Anab. 4.10-12; Plut. Alex. 54; Curtius 8.5, 7-12.

and other Greeks by means of this common court ceremonial.¹ The very fact that it caused great offence to the Greeks must mean that Alexander intended something more than a mere social convention. It was almost certainly little short of a demand by Alexander for the reverence normally reserved for the gods. On the other hand, Tarn's interpretation of the affair as a political device of one who wished to rule over Greeks and barbarians as one nation and needed therefore to become officially the god of an empire presupposes that Alexander held definite ideas of a universal monarchy.² But this is at most a highly rhetorical interpretation of his career by Plutarch and can no longer be maintained for the historical Alexander.³ Indeed, if any divine mission is to be foisted upon Alexander it was rather his self-appointed role as avenger of all the wrongs done to Europe by Trojan and Persian princes. At the same time, however, it is not unlikely that Alexander would be acquainted with the bold sentiments of Isocrates' third letter (to Philip) if this was genuine, in which it was stated that after conquering Persia there would be nothing left but for Philip to become a god. Nor is it improbable that Aristotle taught and inspired the young Alexander about the logically possible Παναβασιλεύς who, although he could never really exist, would, if he did exist, be ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις (Pol. 3.13, 1284a 10-13). At all events, it is after the conquest of Persia that Alexander became more resolved to be considered a god.

If, then, after the oracle of Ammon Alexander may have hoped for deification after his death, he soon ceased to be content with human adoration. His emulation of heroes brought flattery and praise which he probably thought was sincere. Evidently he had overestimated the devotion of Callisthenes and others. But it

¹U. Wilcken, Alexander der Grosse, Eng. Transl. by G. C. Richards (London, 1932) pp. 168f.; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, op. cit., pp. 371ff.

²W. W. Tarn, op. cit., I pp. 79f., II pp. 359ff. (cf. C. A. H. Vol. 6 pp. 399ff.).

³Plut. De Alex. fort. esp. 1.6ff. (328). Tarn's theory of a brotherhood of man (op. cit., II pp. 399ff. and Proc. Brit. Acad. 19, 1933, pp. 123ff.) has been critically and realistically examined by E. Badian, "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind", Historia 7 (1958), pp. 425ff. All these articles may be found in G. T. Griffith's collection.

should not be forgotten that in view of the European opposition to προσκύνησις he did to his credit, albeit judiciously, back down — hardly the action of an omnipotent megalomaniac. Nevertheless, the traumatic nature of his disappointment was clearly shown later in his imperious treatment of Callisthenes (Arr. 4.14, 3; Plut. Alex. 55).

Divine honours from Greek city-states

A few years later it would seem that Alexander would settle for nothing less than full recognition of his divinity while he was still alive.

Towards the end of Alexander's life envoys who came from Greece crowned him with wreaths of gold ὡς θεωροὶ δῆθεν ἐς τιμὴν θεοῦ ἀφ-
υμμένοι (Arr. Anab. 7.23, 2). Further evidence would seem to confirm, though not conclusively prove, that the initiative for such honours came from Alexander himself.¹ Plutarch connects a saying of the Spartan Damis with a request from Alexander (Aprophth. Lac. 219e):

Δάμις πρὸς τὰ ἐπισταλέντα παρὰ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου θεὸν εἶναι ψηφίσασθαι, “συγχωροῦμεν”, ἔφη, “Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, ἐὰν θέλῃ, θεὸς καλεῖσθαι”.

Aelian refers to the same quotation (VH 2.19):

Ἀλέξανδρος... ἐπέστειλε τοῖς Ἕλλησι θεὸν αὐτὸν ψηφίσασθαι... ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλα ἐψηφίσαντο, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἐκεῖνα· “ἐπειδὴ Ἀλέξανδρος βούλετο θεὸς εἶναι, ἔστω θεός.”

In both passages the ψηφίσασθαι suggests a decree. It can be shown from elsewhere that Alexander had at least made it known that he wished to be honoured as a god.

In Athens, where Demades had proposed the recognition of Alexander as thirteenth god (Aelian VH 5.12; Diod. Sic. 16.92; Athenaeus 6.251), Demosthenes had from the start been thoroughly opposed to this or any such measure. Timaeus praises him and others like him who spoke

¹ W. W. Tarn, op. cit., pp. 112ff., and U. Wilcken, op. cit., p. 212, believe in an official decree from Alexander. D. G. Hogarth, Eng. Hist. Rev. 2 (1887) p. 319, J. P. V. D. Balsdon, op. cit., p. 386, and C. A. Robinson, Am. Hist. Rev. 62 (1957) pp. 343ff., are sceptical. See further below, p. 64.

against ἰσόθεος τιμαί (Polybius 12.12b, 2). Dinarchus, however, blames Demosthenes for inconsistency in this respect, "at one time writing and speaking against belief in all but the officially accepted gods, at another time saying that the people ought not to argue about honours in heaven for Alexander" (c. Demosth. 94). The volte-face is verified by an alleged quotation in Hyperides (c. Demosth. 31.15ff.) to the effect that the people should let Alexander be son of Zeus, even son of Poseidon, if he wanted.¹ It is difficult to explain this complete change of attitude without supposing that constraint in one form or another had been brought to bear upon Athens.

If Alexander issued no decree requesting divine honours, it would not be unlikely that he mooted the idea abroad in order to gauge the feelings of the Greek cities.² And even if there was no more than the hint or warning of an imminent request, many states would (partly, no doubt, through fear) be persuaded to anticipate it by awarding divine honours of their own accord. As Alexander might soon be returning home, few cities could feel strong enough to refuse even an informal invitation for them to award these honours or indeed would not wish to ingratiate themselves with the king and thereby compromise their neighbouring rivals.

Balsdon rightly discounts Tarn's theory of a politically motivated decree which would give the king a legal supremacy over the autonomous cities of the League of Corinth.³ Alexander had on at least one previous occasion shown readiness to break the rules of that League.⁴ But in assigning the initiative to Alexander's supporters in the Greek cities Balsdon may be underestimating natural opposition in Europe to the deification of a living human being. We should believe that

¹There can be no doubt about the evidence of Timaeus. But Dinarchus and Hyperides may not have been so disinterested and what they say cannot be taken too literally. This, of course, does not mean that the general change of attitude by Demosthenes was not historical.

²Similar caution was displayed in his secretive attempt to introduce *προβούνησις*.

³J. P. V. D. Balsdon, op. cit., p. 386; W. W. Tarn, op. cit., I pp. 112ff.

⁴See U. Wilcken, op. cit., pp. 78, 212, citing the use of Greek mercenaries formerly in the pay of the Persians and therefore traitors in the eyes of the League.

there is no smoke without fire; and as no official decree can be testified, it is reasonable to deduce from the evidence already cited that the Greeks were aware of Alexander's wishes in this respect.¹

However, there is no evidence that Alexander's divinity was ever taken seriously. On the contrary, if a combination of fear and opportunism had prompted the Athenians to act, it was when that fear had abated and Alexander was dead that they revealed their true colours in punishing Demades, the proposer of their decree (Aelian VH 5.12, etc.). Even Demosthenes' remark (apud Hyperidem) is highly cynical. So also was the acquiescence of the Spartans (see above, p.63). Words attributed to Diogenes, who may not have been alive in 324 B.C., at least reveal the sentiments of the time:

ὑψηλοφαιμένων Ἀθηναίων Ἀλέξανδρον Διόνυσον, κάμ' (ἔφη) Σάρακιν ποιήσατε (D.L. 6.63). A young man, Pytheos, protested that he was older than the man they intended to make a god (Plut. Præcepta gerendae 804b). "Older, in fact, than the eternal" is Balsdon's apposite remark.²

We may be sure of Alexander's aspirations to be honoured as equal of the gods. What we cannot know decisively are his motives. There are many sides to his inscrutable character. He is sometimes the devotee of all gods and renovator of religious cults;³ at other times driven on by his own good fortune he will further his extraordinary ambitions without respect or consideration for the will of the gods.⁴ The hostile tradition, originally Peripatetic, is clearly seen in Aelian VH 2.19 and more especially in Curtius who often adds his own brand of bitter sarcasm to the vindictiveness of one of the sources he follows. Plutarch's De Alex. fort. is a rhetorical answer to the slander of the hostile traditions. And

¹C. Habicht, Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte (Munich, 1956), pp. 35, 227, has suggested that the true wishes of Alexander for himself were expressed with diplomatic tact in the award of heroic honours to the dead Hephaestion (Arr. Anab. 7.4, 7; Diod. Sic. 17. 115).

²Cf. ?Plut. Vitae decem oratorum: Lycurg. 7 (842d) for the less civil remark καὶ ποδαπὸς ἂν εἴη (εἶπεν) ὁ θεὸς οὐ τὸ ἱερόν ἐξελόντας δεήσει περιγραίνεσθαι.

³An extensive list with reference to consecrations, sacrifices, etc. is given by H. Berve, op. cit., I pp. 85ff.

⁴Cf. Arr. Anab. 4.4, 3 (and contrast 5.28, 4); Plut. Alex. 14; De Alex. fort. 2.2, 335ab.

Arrian, though disinterested, often transmits the hagiography of the admiring sources. Is one version likely to preserve the correct picture and the others to give a distorted view? Perhaps all contain a grain of truth in that Alexander could be both pious and haughty, kind and brutal, a megalomaniac and a dreamer (if not a schemer) of universal brotherhood--the different traits in his character being displayed according to his mood and to what suited his purpose at a particular time. One must recognize above all the extreme complexity of this man.

His personality was an enigma open from the start to controversial interpretation.¹ This together with a perhaps misdirected sense of a divine purpose may serve to class Alexander as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. But he falls short of the category in many other respects and is remembered rather as a superior military leader with some charismatic qualities. He himself may have believed in his claim to be divine, but few sincerely recognized it.²

Hellenistic Kings

If the divinity of Alexander was a precedent for the cults which in the years following his death were awarded to his successors, the nature and significance of these later "divine honours" was very different.³

¹Cf. Plutarch's charming anecdote of the wounded Alexander crying out, "See! Blood, not ichor" (De Alex. fort. 2.2, 335ab). Was it cynicism for the benefit of his flatterers, or was it a cry of despair?

²The perfectly natural founder-cult at Alexandria may not have been in the king's own lifetime. See L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, Le Culte des souverains dans la civilisation Gréco-romaine (Tournai, 1956), p. 190. Of other cults the one at Ephesus may belong to the living Alexander (Aelian VH 2.3; Strabo 14.1, 22, 641). See C. Habicht, op. cit., p. 12. After his death Alexander was worshipped in the camp by Eumenes and the Macedonian army (Diod. Sic. 18.61) and by various cities to whom he was a benefactor. See further C. Habicht, op. cit., pp. 17ff.; L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, op. cit., p. 526. On the nature of these cults see the following section.

³On the subject of ruler-cult the works of Habicht and Cerfaux-Tondriau (cited in the previous note) are standard volumes. See also E. Bickerman, Institutions des Seleucides (Paris, 1938), pp. 236ff.; W. W. Tarn and G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilization (3rd ed. London, 1952) pp. 49ff.

First, they were voluntarily granted by cities which were under no direct pressure from the rulers so honoured. Secondly, they were awarded only for a specific service rendered by one ruler to a particular city. Thirdly, one king will have received various honours in different cities according to either the importance of his beneficent aid or the degree of a city's state of helplessness. The precise nature of the service—usually military or economic aid—is often mentioned in the decrees of the thankful cities, and the very epithets used in these decrees (σωτήρ, εὐεργέτης, κτλ.)¹ disclose the motive for their conferment. Naturally the epithet alone does not signify a cult. Indeed sacrifices, altars, festivals, and games were often instituted as additional honours. But deeds are the one criterion for their award, the personality or position of the king has little to do with it.² A change of circumstances could bring with it a corresponding change in attitude, and if a "saviour" failed to maintain his protection or himself became a tyrant, a new deliverer was sought.³ The honours therefore not only expressed gratitude, they also conveyed a hope for security in the future.

One may trace the origin and development of these "benefactor-cults"⁴ not so much from Alexander (whose claim was for recognition as a god rather than for honours equal to a god) as from the perfectly legitimate hero-cults of the dead in the classical period.⁵ A κτίστης or νομοθέτης traditionally received ἥρωικὰ τιμὰί after death (cf. Hdt. 6.38; Strabo 8.366; Cic. Rep. 1.12). The dead of the Persian Wars were similarly heroized (Thuc. 3.58; Plut. Aristides 21; Pausanias 1.32, 4; 9.2, 4). But the interval of a lifetime between

¹Cf. the more familiar κτίστης, οὐκιστής .

²Thus Demetrius Poliorcetes was honoured at Sicyon for ending the rule of Ptolemy I there, but Ptolemy I was honoured by the Cyclades islanders for ending the tyranny of Demetrius! (See Diod. Sic. 20.102, 2ff.; Plut. Demetr. 25; IG 12.7, 505.

³This happened to Demetrius. See previous note and C. Habicht, op. cit., p. 158.

⁴The term is used by M. P. Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 8.

⁵This is originally the view of A. D. Nock in various articles, especially JHS 48 (1928), pp. 21ff. and Harv. Stud. 41 (1930), p. 50. He is followed by M. P. Charlesworth, op. cit., pp. 7ff. and C. Habicht, op. cit., pp. 21ff. For a different opinion see W. Ferguson in CAH vol. 7 pp. 16f.

the heroic service and the heroic honours was scrupulously observed. An outstanding benefactor could expect to earn secular honours (e.g. garlands, public eulogies, statues, seats in the theatre, exemption from taxation, etc.) in his lifetime. He could hope for honours of a more permanent nature only on his death.¹ However, in the Hellenistic age towns could not always afford to wait for their benefactors to die. For they were not local citizens but powerful men of the world who were not certain to remain friendly unless treated with suitable respect. But what was suitable respect? In some cases these men had saved the very existence of cities. It was hardly right for them to be awarded the honours regularly conferred upon men whose services were very inferior by comparison. Thus as a necessary compromise heroic honours were granted to men who were still alive.

Brasidas, who died at Amphipolis in 422 B.C. and was honoured as second founder of that city, now becomes an exemplary precedent. The normal interval of a lifetime between service and reward was removed because he died in the very process of rendering his service. Instantaneous "heroic honours" were possible, directly relating the benefaction to the town and the gratitude of its inhabitants. One may wonder what would have happened if Brasidas had not died. At all events, it was now a very easy step for a benefactor who failed to die on the spot to be rewarded with the honours which he would have received had he done so. And this did happen about twenty years later when at Samos honours were paid to Lysander *ὡς θεῷ*² and nearly half a century after that—but, incidentally, before Alexander—when Dion was called *σωτήρ* and *θεός* and awarded *ἡρωικὰ τιμὰί* by the people of Syracuse.³

The religious significance of these cults may be seen best from a closer examination of one example. Honours which the Athenians

¹There was not the same distinction in the ancient world between what we would call worship and respect. The difference was rather a matter of degree, the former being a more worthy extension of the latter. See previous note and the references there.

²Plut. *Lys.* 18.4 (according to Douris); Pausanias 6.3, 14; Athenaeus 15.52, 696e. The honours were probably awarded by the oligarchic exiles whom Lysander had reinstated in the island. Cf. Thuc. 8.21 and Xen. 2.3, 6.

³Plut. *Dion.* 46.1; Diod. Sic. 16.20, 6. On Dion and Lysander see also C. Habicht, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-10.

had been reluctant to grant to Alexander were voted without constraint for Demetrius Poliorcetes some thirty-six years later. In 307 B.C. he was welcomed in Athens as *σωτήρ* and awarded a *ἱερεὺς* and *βωμὸς* (Plut. Demetr. 8ff.; 10.14; 12.4; Diod. Sic. 20.45-46) because he had driven Cassander's garrison out of the Munychia. Again in 304 B.C. when he repeated the service, the very spot where he stepped down from his horse was consecrated with an altar to Demetrius Cataibates (Plut. Demetr. 10.5; cf. Moralia 338a). By official decree all embassies to him were renamed *θεωροί* and the answers of the king were to be treated with the same respect as oracles (Plut. Demetr. 11 and 13).

There can be no doubt that Demetrius was being treated as a god. But if traditional religious language was now being used of men, the religious sentiment was of a totally different nature. The true explanation of ruler-worship is not to be found in the base servility of the subjects or in the megalomania of the kings. As Gilbert Murray has put it, "There were men now on earth who could do the things that had hitherto been beyond the power of man".¹ In the past, perhaps even in Alexander's day, a city in its hour of need would most naturally pray to the *θεοὶ οἱ ἔχοντες τὴν πόλιν* or *θεοὶ πολιοῦχου* (Plato Leg. 4.717a; Pind. Ol. 5.22; Aesch. Sept. 109; Aristoph. Aves 827). Victory in the Persian Wars had convinced the Greeks that their gods did care for them (Aesch. Pers. 347; Hdt. 7.139; 8.39). However, the political and social upheaval which followed the Peloponnesian War and the constant feuds of the Greek cities which resulted in the suzerainty of Philip and Alexander must have made men begin to lose confidence in their Olympian gods. Whereas formerly in days of famine a prayer to Zeus might be the normal procedure, in Hellenistic times a prayer to Ptolemy had more chances of success. In areas where the gods were no longer effective, powerful men had taken over. And in an age of political instability and religious uncertainty even human "saviours"

¹G. Murray, Five Stages of Greek Religion (Oxford, 1925), p. 189.

were worshipped if they brought peace and prosperity.¹

A hymn sung at Athens in honour of Demetrius, the so-called Ithyphallic hymn of c. 290 B.C., reflects the religious feeling of the time.

ἄλλοι μὲν ἢ μακρὰν γὰρ ἀπέχουσι θεοὶ
 ἢ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὤτα
 ἢ οὐκ εἶσιν ἢ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ ἔν,
 σε δὲ παρόνθ' ὀρώμεν,
 οὐ ξύλινον οὐδὲ λίθινον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινόν.
 εὐχόμεσθα δὴ σοι.
 πρῶτον μὲν εἰρήνην ποιήσον, φίλτατε.
 κύριος γὰρ εἶ σύ.

(Il. 15-22).²

This was a clear vote of no confidence in the gods of the city, who had now been replaced by tangible and visible benefactors known to be reliable. But these men are not themselves gods in the traditional sense of the word. They have rather taken over from the gods and have become as men their "irreligious substitutes".³ If the powers which once were the prerogative only of gods now belonged to one or two supreme human beings, it is reasonable to expect that the language and procedures formerly used only in connection with gods should now be applied to these men. But the primary significance of their cults was political rather than religious, the ritual and formulae of religion being used as a declaration of political loyalty in the

¹The Melians in 416 B.C. may have trusted to their gods in refusing the demands of the Athenians (Thuc. 5.104; cf. 112, 2). The Samians, far more realistically, looked to Lysander in 400 B.C. (See above, p. 68). The Rhodians, too pious at first to believe that their gods had deserted them, sought a compromise. Their patron goddess had actually caused Ptolemy I to intervene in their struggle against Demetrius. See C. Habicht, op. cit., p. 233. Demades, proposer of the decree to recognize Alexander's divinity, aptly warned the Athenians to beware lest in keeping guard on heaven they lose the earth (Val. Max. 7.2, 13).

²Douris apud Athen. 6.253f. = FHG II 449 n.4 and 476 n.30. See Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., pp. 182-86 for the full text with a French translation and commentary.

³W. S. Ferguson, CAH vol. 7 pp. 16f. Cf. the comment in Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., p. 263 that one has to devalue the gods in order to elevate men.

same way as dependent nations today still fly the flag of their mother countries. Any element of flattery, though it cannot altogether be excluded, must be subordinated to the main purpose which was to display genuine gratitude and to express a hope for protection in the future.¹ Nor was this phenomenon a sign of moral decay or a mark of depravity. It showed rather that in the Hellenistic period religion had rapidly been reduced to a pure matter of form.²

The origin of the state-instituted cults may lie either in Alexander's formal request, if he made one, or in the peculiarly Egyptian conception of the Pharaonic king-god. The official cult of living rulers began under the Ptolemies in Egypt, probably c. 273-71 B.C., when Ptolemy II and his wife shared a temple as *θεοὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου* in the cult of Alexander instituted earlier by Ptolemy I.³ A dynastic cult including the worship of living rulers was in operation for the Seleucids certainly in the reign of Antiochus III.⁴ The position of the Ptolemies was really no different from the conventional Egyptian worship of Pharaoh. But in Syria the gods had no legal standing and the Seleucids will have created their own official cults not as a source or renewal of their power but as a consequence of that power.⁵

It is possible that some kings took their divinity more seriously than others. Alexander, as we have seen, emulated Dionysus; so also did Demetrius Poliorcetes (Plut. *Demetr.* 2; Diod. Sic. 2.92, 3f.). This, however, will not be taken to signify identification with that god. These men possessed the superhuman qualities which formerly

¹C. Habicht, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

²M. Cary, *History of the Greek World 323-146 B.C.* (London, 1951) p. 370. At the same time, however, the possibility that some people really did believe in these cults cannot be ruled out. Poorer people will no doubt have welcomed the holidays and festivities (cf. Theocr. *id.* 15). Their enthusiasm may have gone no further. Demetrius, the silversmith at Ephesus was worried as much for his livelihood as for the honour of Artemis when St. Paul visited his city (Acts 19.23-28).

³W. S. Ferguson, *op. cit.*, p. 17; W. W. Tarn and G. T. Griffith, *op. cit.*, pp. 50ff.; cf. *OGIS* 724.

⁴E. Bickerman, *op. cit.*, pp. 247f. There is no evidence for the official cult of living rulers among the Attalids, nor indeed among the kings of Macedonia.

⁵E. Bickerman, *op. cit.*, pp. 256f.

were the sole prerogative of divine beings, and in that sense they were both veritable Dionysuses. But neither of them was the real Dionysus. The common epithets νέος Διόνυσος, νέος Ἀσκληπιός, κτλ. are only vague expressions comparing qualities and powers without implying the incarnation in human form of a definite deity.¹ In other words, to call a king νέος Διόνυσος implied simply the recognition of him as a divine conqueror and culture-bringer of the Dionysus type in an age when outstanding men regularly performed the deeds of gods.

The coins issued by Antiochus IV contain the legend βασιλεύς Ἀντιόχου θεοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς νικηφόρου.² On the tetradrachma a star is placed above the crowned head of the king and on the reverse there is an image of Zeus Nikephoros on the throne. But identification with Zeus is generally doubted. O. Morkholm has shown that Zeus was an important deity for this Antiochus, who may well have sought to unify the Greek and oriental elements of his realm by a common religious bond, but he finds no evidence of this policy being linked to the official cult by any claim of the king to be himself the epiphany of Zeus.³ The distinction between the use of θεός only on coins of the Seleucid kingdom and simply ἐπιφανής on coins minted abroad proves how political rather than personal considerations played the most important part in any belief he may have had in his divinity.⁴

¹A. D. Nock, "Studies in the Graeco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire", JHS 45 (1925), pp. 93f., where he comments on the popularity of the beliefs in νέου θεοί "young and approachable incarnations of the old gods, invested with full vigour". Cf. idem JHS 48 (1928) pp. 30-38 and see Athenaeus 6.212d; Plut. Ant. 60; Lucian Alex. 43.

²After 166 B.C. Antiochus IV became the first Seleucid to use the divine title on his coinage. See W. W. Tarn and G. T. Griffith, op. cit., p. 54; cf. E. Bickerman, op. cit., pp. 238-39. The most recent treatment of this is by O. Morkholm, "Studies in the Coinage of Antiochus IV of Syria", Historisk-filosofiske Meddeleeser 40 (1963) pp. 57ff. For the coin legend see OGIS 253.

³O. Morkholm, op. cit., pp. 58ff. The similarity of the heads of Zeus and Antiochus is unimportant. Engravers often used the same pattern for both sides of a coin, even when the heads were different, distinguishing them only by name (ibid. p. 60).

⁴O. Morkholm, op. cit., p. 72.

As far as the ordinary people of the realm were concerned, expediency—unquestionably the motive for politicians—had less to do with their devotion to the kings. They welcomed the peace and security, if some may still have complained about poverty and other ills. But it is incorrect to speak here in terms of belief or faith, the one thing a ruler would surely find it impossible actually to impose.¹ These were gods in an entirely new context—that of human flesh and blood. And it was perhaps as kings rather than as gods that they were worshipped. Although primarily a political experiment, ruler-worship points also to an important development in the history of Greek religious ideas, namely that the gap between man and god, often seen to be disappearing, was for this phenomenon completely bridged. The traditional gods had been secularized and the old religious sentiment was now defunct. In order to revalue the human it was necessary to devalue the divine. Formal religious language was used only because it was a convenient and known means of honouring extraordinary human beings who had surpassed all other men in their achievements. The essential difference between the Hellenistic king and a *θεός ἀνθρώπου* may be expressed in the following manner: one was worshipped as a genuine divine being of a superior nature from another world; the other was worshipped as a superman very much in and of the present world and not so much an equal as an alternative to the gods.

Roman Emperors

Apart from one reference in Ennius (Ann. 110-117V.) the evidence for the cult of deified men in Roman literature comes from later sources, and it may safely be assumed that the idea was due to Greek influence.² Certainly from the time of Marcellus's capture of Syracuse

¹Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., p. 266.

²Part of the reason may be that the Romans maintained no form of hero-worship except the collective cults of the di Manes and di Penates. See W. Warde Fowler, Roman Ideas of Divinity (London, 1914), pp. 93ff.; Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., pp. 276f. On the early Roman period see also L. R. Taylor, Divinity of the Roman Emperor (Middletown, 1931), pp. 35ff.; M. P. Charlesworth, op. cit., pp. 20-26.

in 212 B.C. Roman generals and governors received secular and divine honours in various Greek city-states.¹ Even in Rome itself, according to Plutarch, sacrifices and divine worship were paid to the dead Gracchi (Plut. C. Gracch. 18). And Marius in 101 B.C. for his victories over the Cimbri and Teutones was offered food and libations *ἅμα τοῖς θεοῖς* (idem Mar. 27.5).² But of early Romans only Scipio Africanus can claim to have enjoyed a legend in which later authors depicted him as something of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. Such a legend was known to Polybius, but he refuses to believe it (Polyb. 10.2, 6-7; 10.5, 8; 10.9, 2).³ It was taken up by Livy, who records conversations between Scipio and various gods which convinced some that he was stirpis divinae vir (26.19, 4ff.; cf. 26.45, 9). Eventually the legend of Scipio's birth acquired the fashionable feature of a visitation by divine serpent to his mother (Aul. Gell. NA 6.1; cf. Val. Max. 1.2, 1).⁴

The honours attested for Julius Caesar in his lifetime were greater than those paid to any previous Roman. Inscriptions are variously attested hailing him as *σωτήρ, εὐεργέτης, θεός, κτίστης*, and *ἐπιφανής θεός*.⁵ But on the question of his official deification by the senate there seem to be conflicting views as to whether this was the culmination of countless secular and divine honours of the Hellenistic type awarded in 44 B.C., or whether the official decree of 42 B.C. was indeed the first and original occasion on which his temple and priesthood

¹Cic. Verr. 2.2, 51; Plut. Marc. 32. Cf. T. Quinctius Flaminius *σωτήρ* in Greece (Plut. Flam. 11, 15-16); the senators as *θεοὶ σωτήρες* in Bithynia (Livy 45, 44, 4; Polyb. 30.18); Sulla at Athens (CIA 2.481 = IG 2.1039); Pompey at Mytilene (IG 12.2, 59). Similar honours were received in Spain by Scipio Africanus, Sertorius, and Metellus Pius (Polyb. 10.38 and 40; Plut. Sert. 11 and 12; Sallust apud Macrob. Sat. 3.13, 8).

²I see no reason to doubt Plutarch. Cicero (Off. 3.80) attests evidence for this sort of honour in the case of Marius Gratidianus (86 B.C.). Cf. M. P. Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 22.

³See F. W. Walbank, "The Scipionic Legend", Proc. Cambr. Philolol. Soc. 193 (n.s. 13), 1967, pp. 54ff.

⁴Cf. Plut. Alex. 2; Suet. Aug. 94; Pausanias 4.14, 7 (of Aristomenes); S. H. A. Alex. 13.

⁵L. R. Taylor, op. cit., Appendix 3 and pp. 58-77, 96-99; Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., pp. 286-295; W. Warde Fowler, op. cit., pp. 112-122.

were instituted.¹ At all events, after Quirinus-Romulus he became Rome's first man-god and the appearance of a comet in the sky during the funeral games of 44 B.C. was popularly interpreted as the sign that his soul had soared aloft to heaven (Pliny HN 2.94).

Augustus may not have felt the same pleasure in the honours of ruler-cult as his adoptive father, but he did not try to prevent them in the provinces. He made one stipulation only, that he should be worshipped in conjunction with Roma; thus he displayed that in the beginning at least these honours were to be viewed as no more than a declaration of loyalty to the Empire.² In his own province of Egypt, however, Augustus as Pharaoh was worshipped as a god. Municipal cults in honour of the emperor's genius seem to have been spontaneous, if also encouraged, throughout the Italian cities.³ It is this cult of the genius Augusti which later became the official state-cult when in 13 B.C. the emperor was also Pontifex Maximus. His genius then became associated with the Roman Penates and Lares.⁴ Finally, after his death in A.D. 14 Divus Augustus was worshipped alongside of the other gods of Rome with his own priest, festivals, sacrifices and eventually (under Gaius) a temple.⁵

The Augustan legend, preserved mainly in Suetonius, demonstrates his superior claim over all future emperors to genuine adoration. Various omens, auguries and signs relating to his birth are recorded (Suet. Aug. 94). These included a dream by his mother that a serpent had visited her in the night. Moreover, as a young infant Octavius was a wonder-child. On one occasion he vanished from his cradle overnight and was found lying on a lofty tower, his face turned towards

¹For discussions of the evidence see F. E. Adcock, CAH, vol. 10, pp. 718-22; L. R. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 70ff.; Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., pp. 291f., 293n. 6; M. P. Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 25 and idem CR 46 (1932), p. 226.

²Suet. Aug. 52.1; Cass. Dio 51.20, 7-8; Tac. Ann. 4.37 and 55. See also L. R. Taylor, op. cit., Appendix 3 and pp. 209-11; Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., pp. 314-22; W. Warde Fowler, op. cit., pp. 130-33. There is less evidence in the Western Mediterranean.

³L. R. Taylor, op. cit., p. 145, pp. 215-16, and idem TAPA 51 (1920), pp. 116ff. Cf. the statement of Cassius Dio that Augustus declined to make himself a god in Italy or Rome (51.20, 8).

⁴Cf. the libation of Horace Carm. 4.5.

⁵Cass. Dio 56.42ff.; Suet. Aug. 100; CIL I.1, pp. 244, 248.

the rising sun (ibid. 94). Soon after he had learnt to talk, he silenced the croaking frogs on his grandfather's estate, and it is said that they remained silent from that day. This numen displayed itself when near the fourth milestone on the Appian Way (note the detail) an eagle which had snatched some bread from Octavius's hand almost immediately returned it to him (ibid.). His early mental development was such that at the early age of twelve he delivered his first public speech (ibid. 8). At fourteen he was granted a priesthood "because of his manly appearance", and the crowds flocked to see him at the Feriae Latinae (Nic. Dam. fr. 127). His remarkable beauty lasted into old age, and he liked to believe that his eyes shone with a divine energy and was pleased if anyone whom he glanced at bowed his head as though dazzled by the sun. His tranquil countenance had even softened the heart of a Gallic chieftain who had planned to assassinate him during a crossing of the Alps (Suet. Aug. 79).

Suetonius also says that Augustus was very superstitious (ibid. 90) and scrupulously obeyed the dreams both of himself and of others if they concerned him (91). He believed implicitly in certain signs, observed taboos (ibid. 92), and respected all ancient and long-established foreign cults (93). His future was predicted several times during his early life (ibid. 94 and 95). He himself was enabled by some extraordinary portent or augury to foreknow the results of important battles (ibid. 96). He seems to have regarded Apollo as his patron and protector (e.g. Prop. 4.6, 27; Aul. Gell. NA 5.12, 12; Cass. Dio 49.15, 5, etc.) and, according to one scandalous story, at a private banquet Augustus masqueraded as Apollo while his guests came dressed as other gods and goddesses (Suet. Aug. 70).¹

His death was predicted by signs, one of which was the melting of the initial C of his name on an inscription below one of his statues. This signified that Augustus would live for only a further hundred days, C being the Roman numeral 100 and AESAR the Etruscan for god (ibid. 97; cf. Cass. Dio 56.29). At his funeral an eagle was released as the pyre was kindled, a sign that Augustus's immortal spirit had departed

¹L. R. Taylor, op. cit., p. 119, suggested that this story was put about by Antony in return for the contempt he himself bore at Rome as νέος Διόνυσος .

from his body (Cass. Dio 56.42ff.).¹ A Roman senator swore that he had seen Augustus's soul soaring up to heaven through the flames (Suet. Aug. 100; Cass. Dio 54.46), which was considered proof of his divinity.

One may ask if this legend was simply the projection by later generations of a saintly character onto the first and (in their view) best of Rome's rulers. But in fact a great part of the legend is reflected in the veneration of Augustus's own time. Arriving on the scene at a critical stage in the history of the world and doing what he did to restore order and equilibrium at home and the hope of peace abroad, it is little wonder that many saw in him the fulfilment of "messianic" hopes for the establishment of a new Golden Age so thoroughly diffused among nations of the world at that time.² When in 17 B.C. the Ludi Saeculares were held, that new age was thought to have been inaugurated. It was foretold by Virgil in his Aeneid (6.792-93) and may even have been planned as early as 40 B.C., and thus predicted also in the Fourth Eclogue.³ As Virgil was dead, Horace wrote the hymn which celebrated the ancient virtues and blessings which under Augustus were returning (Carm. Saec. 57-60) and expressed a hope for Rome's future glory and prosperity (45-48).

The office of Pontifex Maximus and his tribunician potestas gave the emperor a certain amount of sanctity, as did also the title divi filius. Above all, however, the implications of the new name Augustus (27 B.C.) are of the utmost importance for a religious interpretation of the new regime. This certainly helps to raise Octavian higher than humanity.⁴ A purely political explanation of

¹This procedure was repeated at the funerals of later emperors. See L. R. Taylor, op. cit., p. 229n.9.

²See E. Stauffer, Christ and the Caesars (London, 1955), ch. 6 "A Premature Advent Celebration" pp. 81ff.

³See the article "Secular Games" in the Oxford Classical Dictionary (2nd ed. 1970), p. 969 and the reference there to Alföldi, Hermes 1930, 369ff. It is important to remember that the main theme of Eclogue Four is the return of the Golden Age, not the birth of Pollio's or whoever else's son. The child becomes only the symbol and type of the new generation, all of whom were to perform mighty deeds.

⁴For the divine connotation of the name Augustus see Ovid Fasti 1.608ff.; Ennius Ann. 502; cf. Res Gestae 34; Suet. Aug. 7; Cass. Dio 53.16, 6-8.

the name as a cover for the acceptance of an overlord is hardly necessary. Similarly the rejuvenation of the old state-religion and the encouragement of a religious revival would be a very expensive form of political propaganda and unlikely to give real stability to the principate. In any case a political and secular interpretation of everything Augustus did, though it may stand scrutiny, is to my mind rather dull and lacking in sensitivity. It was not a cool and calculating politician who fired the imagination of Horace and Virgil. It was rather a man who as champion of Italy and things Italian had given rise to a faith in the future and in the permanence of Roman (i.e. Italian) civilization. Such a man could well have seen himself, or have been encouraged by others to see himself, as in some sense an agent of the powers of destiny.

Moreover, if the poets were propagandists of the Augustan reign, it was simply because the emperor was pursuing a policy which coincided with their own desires and was thus fulfilling their own cherished hopes. And if there was a degree of flattery in the numerous comparisons of Augustus to Hercules, Dionysus, and other "divine men" of mythology (e.g. Verg. Aen. 6.801-05; Hor. Carm. 3.3, 9-12; cf. 1.2, 441ff.; Ep. 2.1, 1ff.), it could hardly be flattery that inspired so grand a conception as the Aeneid, whose central character so often evokes Augustus.¹ Indeed Virgil long before Augustus was supreme had genuine cause to worship him in Eclogues 1 as a deus who had restored to him his farm.² Later with reluctance the poets refrained from making him a god in his lifetime and instead wrote of one who was destined to become a praesens divus after his death, (Verg. Georg. 1.24ff.; Hor. Carm. 3.5, 1-4). In fact Ovid writes proleptically as if the event had already happened.³

¹See in particular W. A. Camps, An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid (Oxford, 1969), pp. 7, 8, 98f. For an unqualified interpretation of Aeneas as a θεῖος ἄνθρωπος see Brooks Otis, Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry (Oxford, 1964), pp. 220ff., 330ff. et passim.

²Ecl. 1.6-8, cf. 40-43. For another "personal" cult of Augustus cf. Suet. Aug. 5, 2, where a young man on trial for adultery pleads for pardon in the name of his "own especial god". By this he meant the Emperor, for he occupied the place first touched by Augustus at his birth.

³On Ovid see K. Scott, "Emperor Worship in Ovid" TAPA 61 (1930), pp. 43ff. Cf. also Cerfaux-Tondriau, op. cit., p. 334n.5 for other references. On Augustus's own wishes see Cass. Dio 59.9, 5, where a speech is quoted in which he states his belief that a divine status is in some way possible for men who have lived well and died well—a hint that deification should follow only after his death.

Whatever Augustus's precise motives may have been, there is justification at least for one to suspend judgement on him because of the spontaneous and genuine adoration of both his own and later generations. The citizens of Rome and its Empire seem to have regarded him as a godsend, and the serious political commitment attributed to the Augustan poets¹ is due not to any totalitarian party line but to the natural, though no doubt encouraged, reflection of contemporary public opinion in contemporary literature.² Consequently, within the limitations of the phenomenon of ruler-cult Augustus more than any other emperor may have been thought justly by some as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ.

Emperors who succeeded Augustus either conformed to his moderate precedents or departed openly and radically from these in order to satisfy their individual megalomaniac desires. Tiberius stood in so great awe of him that with almost religious determination he refused nearly every superhuman honour which came his way.³ His rejection of the title Augustus may be due to the fact that this was now the epithet of a god and that consistency was demanded in his policy to remain a mortal.⁴ He may have hoped for deification after his death, but Gaius did not press his case. Claudius, who accepted less important honours of ruler-cult in the East,⁵ refused a temple and priesthood at Alexandria because he did not wish to

¹See Gordon Williams, The Third Book of Horace's Odes (Oxford, 1969), p. 9.

²S. Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius (repr. New York, 1957), p. 532: "Yet it may well have been that after the terrible orgies of civil strife through which the Roman world had passed, Augustus was the convinced representative of a repentant wish to return to the old paths".

³At Smyrna he accepted a temple to himself, Livia and the senate (Tac. Ann. 4.15) but refused one in Spain (unprecedented), where he protested his ordinary humanity and asked to be considered only the first among men (Tac. Ann. 4.48). For other refusals see Suet. Tib. 26-27.

⁴See the inscription of Gythium in V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius (2nd ed. Oxford, 1955), pp. 87f. no. 102. Cf. K. Scott, "Tiberius's Refusal of the Title Augustus", CP 27 (1932), pp. 43ff.

⁵See A. Momigliano, Claudius (Cambridge, 1961), p. 72; V. M. Scramuzza, "Claudius Soter Evergetes", Harv. Stud. 51 (1940) pp. 261ff.

appear offensive (*φορτικός*) to his contemporaries: "It is my opinion" he wrote, "that temples and such forms of honour have by all ages been granted as a prerogative to the gods alone."¹

All the miracles, omens and prodigies concerning Vespasian belong only to the beginning of his reign. They are generally seen as the work of propagandists intent on finding divine favour for a new emperor of humble origin.² But if Vespasian was not privy to any intrigue, he showed little objection to the miraculous, only cautiously checking the evidence before he accepted the "signs", or allowing himself first to be convinced that perhaps the gods had chosen him to work miracles before he performed what was required. However, when firmly established on the throne, Vespasian treated either with humour or disdain any belief in his caelestis favor. His well-known wit did not fail him even on his death-bed where he could not resist passing comment on imminent deification with the immortal words: Vae, puto deus fio (Suet. Vesp. 23). Evidence for the emperor's numen is even more emphatically maintained for Titus. Martial in the Liber Spectaculorum³ marvels at an emperor qui iubet ingenium mitius esse feris (epigr. 10). Even an elephant unbidden performed the act of obeisance, thereby nostrum sentit et ille deum (17). The reason for this and similar miracles is that numen habet Caesar (30).

Of later emperors Hadrian is said to have worked miracles, but at least one person suspected these as per simulationem facta (S.H.A. Hadr. 25). The Severi may have placed greater importance on the religious character of their position. Septimius dreamt before his death that he was being carried off to the sky, summoned by Jupiter

¹V. M. Scramuzza, The Emperor Claudius (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 64ff. The temple in Britain is now thought to have been completed after Claudius's death. See D. Fishwick in Britannia 3 (1972).

²Tac. Hist. 2.78; 4.81; 5.13; Suet. Vesp. 4, 5, and 7; Josephus BJ 3.403-08. See also K. Scott, The Imperial Cult under the Flavians (Stuttgart-Berlin, 1936), pp. 1-19.

³For the date of this book (A.D. 80) see O. Weinreich, Studien zu Martial (n.p. 1928), pp. 21-23; K. Scott, op. cit., pp. 54ff. We should not expect the praise of Titus to be any more sincere than the acknowledged flattery of Domitian after him. See below, p. 81.

(S.H.A. Sev. 19.6; 24.2; cf. Herodian 4.21f.). The mother of Alexander Severus—who himself later worshipped other *θεῖοι ἄνδρες* in a private lararium (S.H.A. Alex. 29.2; 31.4)—had a dream similar to the mothers of Alexander, Scipio and Augustus,¹ and his father in a dream saw him being carried to the sky by Victory (S.H.A. Alex. 13).

The delicate arrangements of Augustus for the imperial cult received some severe jolts from extremists who came to the throne. Gaius identified himself with Jupiter (Suet. Gaius 22).² He also dressed up as Venus (ibid. 52) and as Diana and Hera (Cass. Dio 59.26, 6). He even replaced the heads on statues of the gods with those of his own (Suet. Gaius 22).³ Nero preferred to be compared to Apollo and later to Hercules (Suet. Nero. 53; Cass. Dio 63.9 and 20). Lucan compared him to the sun (1.49; cf. Cass. Dio 63.6.2; Calp. Sic. 7.83).

Domitian pursued a policy of absolute monarchy in which he was dominus et deus (Suet. Dom. 13).⁴ He claimed to be the son of Minerva (Philostr. VA 7.24). In Martial and Statius he is noster Jupiter or noster tonans (Mart. 7.56; 14.1; Stat. Silv. 1.6, 25-27).⁵ In Martial the lesser deity, Hercules, worships Domitian his superior (9.64; cf. 9.101). Also in the poets the emperor's numen exerted its power over birds, animals and fish as well as men and inanimate objects (Stat. Silv. 1.1, 61-63; 2.4, 29; Mart. 4.30; 9.73; 8.21; 9.23). He possessed a strange power in his eyes (Stat. Silv. 5.1, 81-83), and his beauty was described as an emanation of the divine power within him (Stat. Silv. 4.2, 41-44; Mart. 8.65, 3-4). But the shallowness and complete insincerity of Martial's flattery may be seen from his recantation under Nerva (10.72).

Commodus identified himself with Hercules and imitated some of the famous Labours by rigging atrocities in the arena (Cass. Dio 72.7, 1-2;

¹See above, p. 74 n.4.

²Gaius even threatened Jupiter with the words ἢ ἐγὼ σέ (Iliad 23.724).

³On Gaius see J. P. V. D. Balsdon, The Emperor Gaius (Oxford, 1934), pp. 157ff. Philo and Josephus both thought he was mad.

⁴The titles *κύριος* and *θεός*, common in the East, are used here for the first time in Rome. See M. P. Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 35; K. Scott, op. cit., p. 102n.1.

⁵In Stat. Silv. 4.3, 128f. and Martial 6.10 the idea (prominent later on) of the emperor as agent of god is asserted.

72.20, 2-3; S.H.A. Comm. 15).¹ Caracalla imitated Hercules and Dionysus (Cass. Dio 77.7, 4; 78.7, 2; S.H.A. Carac. 5) principally because he conceived of himself as a new Alexander (Cass. Dio 77.7, 1-2 and 9, 1; S.H.A. Carac. 2). But the real extent of his belief in apotheosis is seen in his reported statement after the murder of Geta: sit divus dum non sit vivus (S.H.A. Geta 2). Elagabal may have considered himself an incarnation of the sun (S.H.A. Heliog. 18.3; 23.5). After a long series of ephemeral emperors a final lease of life was given to the imperial cult under Jovius (Diocletian and Herculius (Maximian), until Constantine rejected the idea of a living emperor as god in favour of the Christian and Stoic concept of rule by the grace of god.

Roman emperors were no more divine in the fullest sense of the word than either Alexander or the Hellenistic kings. One cannot, perhaps, hope to know the feelings of every citizen or subject in the Empire, but most will have seen the political necessity for acquiescing in the masquerade. Yet although religious language had now lost much of its meaning in the eyes of many, there were parts of the world in which a new and strong trust in the divine was rapidly extending its influence. The early Christians, as well as the Jews, were bound to see greater significance in the words *κύριος* and *σωτήρ* and were obliged therefore to oppose ruler-cult. If, however, there still existed in some quarters of the Graeco-Roman world a belief and perhaps a hope in the possibility of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, it was not to be realized adequately in a divine ruler. Alexander and Augustus might have had their lives interpreted in this way by later generations had not the unique qualities of their status in the world been debased in each case by the imitations of successors. Nevertheless the role of *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* in its fullest and deepest sense had proved too great for a king. The concept was well discussed in various forms, as the next chapter will reveal; but when it suddenly took on the life of a real human being, the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, so far from being a king, was no more than an obscure travelling Pythagorist of Cappadocia with only the position and status which nature had given him by birth.

¹Cf. Nero's attempt to fake a numen by similar means (Suet. Nero 53).

CHAPTER IV

DIVINE MAN AND DIVINE KING IN PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT

Statesman and King

To judge from the number of lost works whose titles alone are recorded, there is good reason to suppose that theories of kingship were much discussed in the ancient world.¹

At least one political theorist of the early fourth century conceived of the ideal state as one in which the ruler surpassed his subjects in physical, intellectual and moral strength. Xenophon, who also portrayed the noble kingly qualities of Hiero and Agesilaus, was prepared in the Cyropaedia to describe something more than the history of a king. He chose Cyrus as a type of ideal king and put forward his life as the pattern of how a good king ought to live. Using some fact, some fiction, and some legends (which Herodotus knew but chose to ignore--Hdt. 1.95), Xenophon presents a thoroughly Hellenic and composite portrait of Socrates, the Younger Cyrus, Clearchus, Agesilaus and Xenophon himself.²

¹Cf. D. L. 5.22 (Aristotle), 42, 49 (Theophrastus), 59 (Strato); 6.18 (Antisthenes); 7.36 (Zeno), 167 (Dionysus), 175 (Cleanthes), 178 (Sphaerus); 10.28 (Epicurus). For other references see also E. R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship", Yale Cl. Stud. 1 (1928), pp. 58ff.

²See W. Miller in the Loeb edition (1914) vol. 1, p. xii. Cf. R. Hoistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King (Uppsala, 1948), pp. 73ff. The non-historical nature of the Cyropaedia was noted by Cicero Q. Frat. 1.1, 23.

It is particularly in the account of Cyrus's death that Xenophon uses the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* for his idealized king. No doubt he was influenced by the versions of Socrates' death, but there are certainly non-Platonic elements in his description.¹ The king was warned of his approaching death in a vision as he slept: a superhuman being (*κρείττων τις*) drew near and beckoned him with the words *Συσκευάζου, ὦ Κύρε· ἤδη εἰς θεοὺς ἄπαι* (8.7, 2). When he woke up, he immediately performed a sacrifice and gave thanks to the gods for always being able to recognize their providence and for never thinking in time of prosperity thoughts beyond his mortal station (8.7, 3).

Continuing to emphasize the religious element, Xenophon, unlike Herodotus (1.214), describes a peaceful passing in which Cyrus prays for his family and friends and in his last words includes a summary of his personal belief in the immortality of the soul (8.7, 6ff). With directions for a simple funeral the king bids all rejoice as he covers his head and dies (8.7, 25). The conception here is of a king who is consistently and sincerely a devotee of the gods and one who has lived his life in close affinity to them (1.6, 4). The general impression, however, is of a *εὐδαίμων ἀνὴρ*, not a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

In Plato the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is almost synonymous for the really true philosopher. It is in fact suggested in Theaetetus 176b that the aim of men should be *ὁμοίως θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν*, and that the way to achieve this was to become just, holy and full of wisdom. In the Republic the Guardians are to aim at becoming *θεοσεβείς τε καὶ θεῖοι* (2.383c; cf. Leg. 2.666d). In Sophist 216bc Theodorus applies the epithet *θεῖος* to an Elean stranger and in general to all philosophers.² Socrates adds that it is not much easier to recognize this class of beings (the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* —true philosopher) than that of the gods; for they appear in the likeness of statesmen or sophists and visit the cities of mankind, where they are acclaimed by some and thought worthless or mad by others (216cd).³ This distinction is again not easy for Socrates when he describes Theuth, the first man

¹ Antisthenes also wrote on Cyrus (D.L. 6.16).

² *καὶ μοι δοκεῖ θεὸς μὲν ἀνὴρ οὐδαμῶς εἶναι, θεῖος μὲν.*
Cf. Meno 99d, where the term *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is the accepted one for excellent men in Sparta.

³ Cf. Homer Od. 17.485ff. In the Symposium the Philosopher is a *δαίμωνιος ἀνὴρ* (203a, 209b).

to observe that sound was infinite, as *εἴτε τις θεὸς εἴτε καὶ θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* (Phileb. 186).

The true statesman or philosopher-king, if ever he existed, would be a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. In the Statesman the expert adviser is deliberately contrasted with the divine shepherd of the age of Cronus. The man Plato sought was not a god, for he was to be closer to his subjects than a shepherd to sheep (275c), but at the same time there must be something godlike about his nature (cf. 309c).¹ In the Laus w/ he was less confident of discovering such a man, but the possibility of an inspired legislator, (*θεῖα μοῖρα γεννηθεῖς*) if it is only a formal one, is nevertheless stated (9.875cd; cf. 4.711e-712a; 12.951b).²

As far as Aristotle was concerned, it was the life of contemplation that raised men above the level of other human beings (Eth. Nic. 10.7, 8, 1177b 33). Indeed this was achieved by reason of the divine element in man; and so far from following the traditional Pindoric formula *τὸ θνητὸν φρονεῖν*,³ it should be man's aim *ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἁθανατίβειν* (ibid.). But in a different context he admits that the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* in the sense in which the Spartans refer to those whom they admire is a rarity (Eth. Nic. 7.1, 2-3, 1145a 23ff.). It is clear too that Aristotle, like Plato, held that the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* took up a half-way station between gods and men. He calls happy and blessed the gods and "the most godlike of men", but to all others he awards praise only (Eth. Nic. 1.12, 4, 1101b 24). By this he means that since praise involves a comparison with something else, certain beings who are beyond comparison merit something higher and better.⁴

Similarly in the Politics he teaches that if there existed a man who was so superlatively excellent that he was incomparable in terms of goodness and ability with the rest of the citizens, such a one

¹See J. B. Skemp, Plato's Statesman (London, 1952), p. 51n.3.

²Cf. the attitude in Meno 99d, where Plato transfers *θεῖος*, the normal epithet for seers and poets, to politicians because they advise what is right not from a consideration of reason but *κατ' ἐχόμενους ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*.

³Aristotle quotes Euripides Fr. 1040 and Pindar Isthm. 4.16.

⁴Cf. the Aristotelian classification of rational creatures into three categories: god, man and such as Pythagoras (On the Pythagoreans Fr. 192 Rose).

should be regarded as transcending the state rather than simply participating in it and may reasonably be considered *ὥσπερ . . . θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις* (Pol. 3.13, 1284a). This to the philosopher must surely signify something more than the phrase "Triton among the minnows".¹ No doubt Priam meant no more when he called Hector god among men (Iliad 24.258).² But Aristotle's god among men was, above all else, a good *πολιτικός ἀνὴρ* and therefore recalls the Platonic *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* of Sophist. 216 and the species described by Aristotle himself in Eth. Nic. 1.12, 4.³

Isocrates, who often equates immortality with everlasting fame (Philipp. 135; Archidam. 109; Evaq. 3), writes in his Third Letter (to Philip) that if the king of Macedon conquered Persia, there would be nothing left for him *πλὴν θεὸν γενέσθαι* (5).⁴ Moreover, it would appear that Isocrates regarded a king as someone special. In the oration To Nicocles 5 he states the general opinion that in respect of honours, wealth and power kings are *ἰσόθεοι*, but that few men would accept the risks involved. In fact the office of king, though any man might inherit it, was one of the most important of human activities demanding supreme wisdom (ibid. 6). He then proceeds to advise the young Cyprian monarch on practical kingship.

Three nominal Pythagorean philosophers, who are variously dated between Hellenistic times and the second century A.D., present a political philosophy of kingship which owes much to the Peripatetics, the Stoics, and the Platonic tradition. Diotogenes' view (Stobaeus Flor. 4.7, 61, 263ff.)⁵ is very similar to that of Dio Chrysostom.

¹This phrase is used by T. A. Sinclair in his Penguin translation of the Politics (1962), p. 132.

²Parallel references are Theognis 339; Aristophanes Tritagonistes Fr. 209; Isocrates Evaq. 9.72. See J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "The Divinity of Alexander", Historia 1 (1950), pp. 354ff.

³Aristotle was describing the quasi-metaphysical grading of a humanly inconceivable paragon. Cf. V. Ehrenberg, Alexander and the Greeks (Oxford, 1938), p. 74; J. P. V. D. Balsdon, op. cit., p. 371.

⁴See above, ch. III p. 62. On the authenticity of this letter see L. F. Smith, The Genuineness of the Ninth and Third Letters of Isocrates (Lancaster Pa. 1940) and cf. L. van Hook in the Loeb edition of Isocrates (1945) vol. 3 p. 368n. a.

⁵On these three see E. R. Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 55ff., whose references to Stobaeus I quote. (In Gaisford's edition pp. 330ff.). It is not clear how much, if any, of this philosophy of sovereignty was known or accepted by Hellenistic monarchs. Only Antigonos Gonatas seems to have sought some philosophical basis for his rule. See W. W. Tarn and G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilization, p. 52; cf. Tarn in CAH vol. 7 pp. 197-203).

The office of king is a divine one (θεόμιμον) and one of the king's aims should be to draw himself close to the gods (συναγγίζοντα δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς). As a "living law" (νόμος ἔμφυχος)¹ he is transformed into a θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις. Sthenidas (Stob. Flor. 4.7, 63, 270ff.) maintains the importance of a fatherly disposition on the king's part towards his subjects² and believes that a wise king will be μιματὰς ἄρα καὶ ὑπαρέτας... νόμιμος τῷ θεῷ. Pseudo-Ecphantus (Stob. Flor. 4.7, 64-66, 271ff.) makes two important points: the king is among men a most divine creature (θείοτατον) and βασιλεία is most difficult for a human being to attain because it is exceedingly divine (δι' ὑπερβολὰν θείοτατον). The king is also predestined to play the more mystical role of mediator between gods and men and it is his duty to liken himself to the gods in whose nature he ought to share, realizing how much more divine he is than other men and how much more divine than he are the gods.

Cicero makes his position on ruler-cult quite clear. He himself refused a temple in Asia "for fear of arousing the envy of men to whom such honours were not due" (Q. Frat. 1.1, 26) and in writing to Atticus he almost takes pride in boasting that as governor of Cilicia nullos honores mihi nisi verborum decerni sino, statuas, fana, τέθριππα prohibeo (Att. 5.21). He does, however, record the honours awarded to other men, as, for example, to Marius Gratidianus in 86 B.C. (Off. 3.80), and it is certain that he approved of the idea of benefactor-cults. It was, he says, by reason of their services to mankind that outstanding individuals like Heracles, Castor and Pollux, Asclepius, Dionysus, and Romulus were "raised to heaven" (Nat. D. 2.24, 61; cf. 1.15, 38; 3.19, 50; Leg. 2.8, 19; 2.11, 27) Elsewhere Cicero makes a distinction between the "immortal" souls of all men and the "divine" souls of good men (Leg. 2.11, 27). In the Pro Sestio he holds up for imitation men like Brutus, Camillus, Scipio and others who, like them, have made the state strong: quos equidem in deorum immortalium coetu ac numero repono (Sest. 143). Similarly he attributes to Laelius the feeling that in view of the

¹For this term see E. R. Goodenough, op. cit., p. 85 and E. Bréhier, Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philo d'Alexandrie (Paris, 1950), pp. 18-23, commenting on its occurrence in Philo VM 2.4. Possibly the germ of the concept first appeared in Xen. Cyrop. 8.1, 22.

²Cf. Stob. Flor. 4.7, 67, 279ff. for a similar remark by Musonius.

glory which met Scipio on the day before his death ex tam alto dignitatis gradu ad superos videatur deos potius quam ad inferos pervenisse (Amic. 3.12).¹

Moreover, Cicero believed that politics was, so to speak, a munus humanum adsignatum a deo² and statesmanship, therefore, a divine occupation. The wise man will inevitably be involved in statecraft: neque enim est ulla res, in qua propius ad deorum numen virtus accedat humana, quam civitatis aut condere novas aut conservare iam conditas (Rep. 1.7, 12).³ Indeed the office requires the services of a divini paene viri (ibid. 1.29, 45). Romulus was Rome's first statesman of divine origin (ibid. 1.41, 64): his divinum ingenium prompted men to believe in his divinum genus (ibid. 2.2, 4). And it was genuinely believed that his translation deorum in numero was a real event (ibid. 2.10, 17ff.; cf. 1.16, 25). Cicero piously records the famous story of how the deified Romulus had instructed Julius Proculus to arrange for the building of a temple on the Quirinal hill and affirmed se deum esse et Quirinum vocari (ibid. 2.10, 20).

In addition to the awards of statues, triumphs and laurel wreaths the divina virtus of all true statesmen demands stabilliora quaedam et viridiora praemiorum genera (ibid. 6.8, 8).⁴ The nature of these rewards is more precisely explained later as the assurance of a place in heaven: certum esse in caelo definitum locum...; harum (civitatum) rectores et conservatores hinc profecti huc revertuntur (ibid. 6.13, 13). Rector was Cicero's favourite word for his ideal statesman (ibid. 6.1, 1).⁵

¹Laelius follows this up with a rejection of current theories on the mortality of the soul, as if to confirm his belief in Scipio's immortality.

²V. Pöschl, Römischer Staat und Griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero (Darmstadt, 1962), p. 174, quoting from Rep. 6.15, 15 where the phrase is used of the vita hominum.

³Perhaps Cicero was thinking here of the cult titles κτίστης and σωτήρ. Cf. Rep. 3.3, 4 incredibilis quaedam et divina virtus used to describe the art of statecraft.

⁴There is a lacuna in the text and any further amplification is therefore missing.

⁵The concept of rector or gubernator (Rep. 5.6, 8; cf. 1.40, 62) is compared to Diotogenes' helmsman (Stob. Flor. 4.7, 61) by G. H. Poyser, Cicero: De Re Publica (Cambridge, 1948), p. 25; cf. G. H. Sabine and S. B. Smith, M. Tullius Cicero On the Commonwealth (Columbus, 1929), p. 95.

He also believed that monarchy was the ideal form of government, although there were definite practical difficulties, and that the qualities of his ideal statesman, his rector, were best seen in a good king (ibid. 1.54-65; cf. 2.29, 51). But clearly the rector was not necessarily of royal blood and it would be worthwhile to search far and wide among all the citizens in order to find him.¹

Seneca's attitude to the deification of rulers is not always consistent.² He approved of the divine Augustus (Clem. 1.10, 3) and his flattery of Nero (Consol. ad Polyb. 12.5) was prompted by a hope that the young emperor would prove a second Augustus. In the Apocolocyntosis, however, he ridiculed the deification of Claudius, and one may wonder from the tone of this satirical pamphlet if its author took apotheosis seriously at all. Only the vir bonus et sapiens was in any sense divine. And if this man was also a ruler he was considered second only to the gods, the state gazing on its rector as all men with veneration gaze on the immortal gods: quid autem? non proximum illis (dis immortalibus) locum tenet is, qui se ex deorum natura gerit, etc. (Clem. 1.19, 8-9). But the mere fact of a man being a ruler does not of itself give him the status of a god; much less that of a bonus et sapiens. It is the good and wise man who achieves divinity, and all men, not just rulers, can become good and wise.³

The Elder Pliny believed in the custom of deifying good emperors and was ready to approve of this for rector Vespasianus Augustus (HN 2.18). The Younger Pliny, although he praises Trajan for never forgetting that he is a mortal (Paneg. 2.52 and 54), could not always remember this himself (cf. ibid. 1, 4, 7, 11, 80, and 88). The Panegyricus is in the main a bitter tirade against divine honours in general and those in particular accepted by Domitian.⁴ Yet Pliny

¹Quem virum facite ut agnoscatis (Rep. 2.29, 51). Thus the rector becomes the Greek βασιλικὸς ἀνὴρ. Cf. V. Pöschl, op. cit., pp. 30ff. It may be that Augustus originally conceived of himself as Cicero's rector, who, so far from being a dictator, stood out only in auctoritas (= personal ascendancy) rather than in potestas. Cf. Res Gestae 34 and see G. H. Poyser, op. cit., pp. 25ff.

²See M. Altman, "Ruler-cult in Seneca", CP 33 (1938), pp. 198ff.

³See below, pp. 95f.

⁴See K. Scott, "The Elder and Younger Pliny on Emperor Worship", TAPA 63 (1932), pp. 156ff.

approves of them for Titus and, by implication, for Trajan (ibid. 11.1-4). Both Plinys saw the practical value of ruler-cult as an incentive to virtuous government.¹

Finally, the Stoic-Cynic ideal king is presented in discourses of Dio Chrysostom, the first four of which are addressed to Trajan.² Dio believes almost in a divine mission for himself and describes in full his meeting with an aged Arcadian prophetess who predicts that he will give a message to a great ruler (Or. 1.56). He puts forward a religious and cosmic interpretation of the ideal ruler. Kingship becomes a god-given office (1.12 and 15; 3.50ff.). The king as son of Zeus (now = god in general) is appointed by god to serve mankind and should imitate the organization of the universe in the management of the state (1.13f., 37ff.; 2.72, 75ff.; 3.39, 45, 51ff., 62, 107; 4.39, 63).³ He will be *θεοφιλής* and will devote himself to the service of the gods (3.51, 115) and to the well-being of his subjects (1.23). Indeed his delight in bestowing benefits is the one thing which draws him nearest to the nature of the gods (*ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐγγυτάτω τῆς τῶν θεῶν φύσεως* —2.26). His personality will be such that those who meet him will feel not *ἐκπληξίς* or *φόβος* but *αἰδώς* (1.25, -cf. 24).

The king was worthy of the highest honour among men (2.69). When the Cynics adopted Heracles as ideal pattern for their hero and king, they naturally regarded his deification as due to the *ἀρετή* which he had displayed in his earthly life (2.78). Dio owes much also to the Cynic conception of a suffering and serving Heracles who earned his divinity through *πόνος* (1.59ff.).⁴ It is this ideal which he would like to see Trajan follow. At all events, he calls him, as a good emperor, *μακάριος* and refers to his power as *τὸν μέγιστον . . . μετὰ τοὺς θεοὺς* (3.3).⁵

¹ K. Scott, op. cit., p. 165.

² Cf. Or. 56 and 62 also on Kingship.

³ This approaches the idea of a divine shepherd which Plato in the Politicus rejected and Xenophon in the Cyropaedia partly adopted. Cf. Or. 1.17-20 and see J. B. Skemp, Plato's Statesman, pp. 59ff.

⁴ See below, pp. 93f.

⁵ On ruler-cult in Plutarch see K. Scott, JAPA 60 (1929), pp. 117ff. and his conclusion that for Plutarch the very idea seemed offensive and in bad taste and that the reason for so many of the incidental remarks to this effect may be that he was thinking of Caligula and Nero.

Wise Man

After the sanctification of Socrates in Platonic and other literature¹ a traditional picture began to take shape for the popular conception of all wise men. It is true that no later philosopher before Apollonius was held in the same degree of veneration as Socrates. However, a definite saintly standing tended to be expected in traditions on both prominent and ordinary exponents of Stoicism, Cynicism and other creeds. In the last three centuries B.C. and the first century A.D. travelling preachers became increasingly familiar figures, and although their motives were not always of the purest kind, the great mass of criticism directed against charlatan philosophic missionaries ought to guarantee the existence of at least a few genuine wise men whom the many seem to have travestied.²

Evidence, some of which must have been early, for the divine qualities of wise men can be seen in the Lives of Diogenes Laertius. General eulogistic features in the separate biographies can be omitted here. A number of more significant details, however, should be observed. For example, Democritus as a result of certain predictions was considered by most men to be worthy of *ἐνθέου δόξης* (D.L. 9.39).³ Diogenes of Sinope was compared to Heracles (D.L. 6.50) and is said himself to have called good men *θεῶν εἰκόνας* (D.L. 6.51). He also reasoned thus: everything belongs to the gods; wise men are friends of the gods and friends hold all things in common; therefore everything belongs to wise men (D.L. 6.37 and 72). Timon of Phlius praised Pyrrho, his teacher, for having shaken off the slavery and trickery of dogmatic teaching (Silloi, Fr. 480) and again asked how he alone among men led the life of a god (*θεοῦ τρόπον ἡγεμονεύων* — Imag. Fr. 67D).⁴ The teachings of Epicurus in the Letter to Menoecus

¹See above, ch. II. For the Stoic wise man as *βασιλεύς* see D.L. 7.122.

²See also below, ch. VIII pp. 208ff. For criticism of false impersonators of the spiritual director cf. Dio Chrys. Or. 32.9; Lucian Fugitivi passim; Epictetus Diatr. 3.22, 80. See also S. Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius (repr. New York, 1957), pp. 334 ff.

³The source is probably Antisthenes. Cf. Pliny HN 18.273, 341; Clem. Alex. Strom. 7.32.

⁴Cf. D.L. 9.65.

(D.L. 10. 122ff.) are said to confer immortal blessings on a man and to ensure that he will live *ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις* (D.L. 10.135).

The Stoics believed all good and wise men to be godlike: *θείου γ' εἶναι ἔχειν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς οἰονεὶ θεόν* (D.L. 7.119). It is natural, therefore, that epitaphs of Zeno (D.L. 7.29-30) call him *σεμνός* (Zenodotus, Anth. Pal. 7.117) or *ὅς ποτ' Ὀλυμπον ἔδραμεν, ... τὰν δὲ ποτ' ἄστρα ἀτραπιτὸν μούνας εὔρε βαοφροσύνας* (Antipater, Anth. Plan. 3.104).¹

The Stoic wise man was thought by many of the ancient philosophers to be an unattainable model.² Others believed that he may have existed once or twice, but was as rare as the Phoenix (Seneca Ep. 42.1; Tranq. 7.4; Plutarch de Stoic. repugn. 31).³ But if ever he did exist, it is clear that he would be regarded, with certain limitations, as a god.

Seneca used religious language of the great philosophers like Socrates, Plato, Zeno, Cato and others who were worthy ritu deorum colendi (Ep. 64.9). A wise man will have no less felicitas than the gods except that the gods live for ever (Ep. 73.13), and apart from mortality he is godlike in every way: sapiens...vicinus proximusque dis consistit, excepta mortalitate similis deo (De Const. Sap. 2.8, 2). Moreover, such a man shares not only friendship with the gods but also kinship:

Inter bonos viros ac deos amicitia est conciliante virtute. Amicitiam dico? Immo etiam necessitudo et similitudo, quoniam quidem bonus tempore tantum a deo differt, discipulus eius aemulatorque et vera progenies, etc. (Prov. 1.5).⁴

Elsewhere the wise man is spoken of as the equal of the gods:

¹The manner of Zeno's death is related by D.L. in a half humorous half mystical way. Tripping and breaking a toe as he fell, he beat on the earth with his hand, cried out *ἔρχομαι· τί μ' αὔεις*, and immediately surrendered his life by holding his breath (D.L. 7.28 and 31).

²Especially by Chrysippus. See E. V. Arnold, Roman Stoicism (Cambridge, 1911), p. 298; M. Pohlenz, Die Stoa (2 vols. Göttingen, 1948), I pp. 257f.

³See C. J. de Vogel, Greek Philosophy, (3 vols. Leiden, 1959-63), III p. 164.

⁴Cf. Ep. 31.8 deorum socius, non supplex and Cons. ad Helv. 11.7, where the animus is said to be liber et deis cognatus.

sapiens...cum dis ex pari vivit (Ep. 59.14). He even becomes a god who lodges in human form: quid aliud vocas hunc quam deum in corpore humano hospitantem (Ep. 31.11).

Finally, in Ep. 115.3-5 Seneca enlarges on his picture of the bonus et sapiens. He presents a character sketch of a true θεός ἀνθρώπου whose qualities render him sanctus and venerabilis and whose appearance evokes adoration, prayers and worship. Both the tone and the content of this passage merit its inclusion here almost in its entirety:

Si nobis animum boni viri liceret inspicere, o quam pulchram faciem, quam sanctum, quam ex magnifico placidoque fulgentem videremus...Nemo illam amabilem qui non simul venerabilem diceret! Si quis viderit hanc faciem altiore fulgentioreque quam cerni inter humana consuevit, nonne velut numinis occursum obstupefactus resistat et ut fas sit vidisse tacitus precetur, tum evocante ipsa vultus benignitate productus adoret ac supplicet, et diu contemplatus multum extantem superque mensuram solitorum inter nos aspici elatam, oculis mite quiddam sed nihilominus virido igne flagrantibus, tunc deinde illam Vergili nostri vocem verens atque attonitus emittat?

O quam te memorem, virgo? namque haud tibi vultus
mortalis, nec hominem sonat; ...
sis felix, nostrumque leves, quaecumque, laborem.¹

...colitur autem non taurorum opibus corporibus...nec auro argentoque...sed pia et recte voluntate.

No one need question the sincerity of this portrait. One may ask, however, whether Seneca was thinking of a real person here or whether the grand hyperbole of language corresponds to the remote possibility of such an ideal ever being realized.²

The Cynic conception of wise man often approaches closely to the godlike sage of Stoicism. Epictetus regarded Socrates, Diogenes and Zeno as men admonished by god to examine, rebuke and instruct others (Diatr. 3.21). He also called Diogenes and Heracleitus on

¹Verg. Aen. 1.327-28, 330. (The omitted words are: o dea certe,--/an Phoebe soror? an Nympharumque sanguinis una--.)

²Cf. M. Pohlenz, op. cit., II pp. 155ff.

account of their self-control *ἀξίως Θεῶν* (Ench. 15). Indeed the true Cynic was no less than an *ἄγγελος ἀπὸ τοῦ Διὸς* sent to disclose to mankind the nature of good and evil (Diatr. 3.22).¹ Even Lucian, a fierce critic of vulgar Cynicism in his own day, was prepared to admit that in Demonax (and probably also in Sostratus)² the first two centuries A.D. had produced one or two worthy personalities in the mould of Antisthenes, Diogenes and Crates.³

Now whereas Seneca, Thræsea Paetus, Musonius Rufus and others turned to their ideal sapiens for a model, exponents of Cynic philosophy, such as Demetrius and Dio Chrysostom, had in their conception of Heracles (and Odysseus) a paragon of ideal virtue. It is not surprising then that a portrait of Heracles as *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* who willingly undergoes suffering in order to serve mankind is a prominent feature in the Cynic tradition. It is reflected in Diodorus Siculus (4.8-39)⁴ and in Dio Chrysostom (Or. 8.28; cf. 1.59-84; 2.78). It was known to Isocrates (Philipp. 114; Demonicus 50) and is expressed, perhaps, least unequivocally by the author of the Lucianic Cynic dialogue who refers to the hero as *θεῖον δὲ ἄνδρα καὶ θεὸν ὁρθῶς νομισθέντα* (13).⁵

Divine Spark in Every Man

An ideal wise man who, if ever he existed, would in theory be divine was of little comfort to many philosophers of the Roman period.

¹ Cf. ibid., I pp. 341ff.

² It is generally presumed that there is a lost work on Sostratus. Cf. Lucian Dem. 1 and see Real-Encyclopædie Suppl. 8. p.782.

³ For Lucian's attitude to Antisthenes, Diogenes and Crates see M. Caster, Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps (Paris, 1937) pp. 68ff. For the appraisal of Demonax and criticism of other Cynics see below, ch. VIII pp.207ff.

⁴ Diodorus Siculus (4.24, 1) relates that Heracles was first worshipped in his own lifetime at Agyrium (the author's home town) "on equal terms with the Olympian gods" and that this was the only honour of its kind that the hero was willing to receive *τοῦ δαίμονιός τήν ἀθανάσιαν αὐτῷ προσημαίνοντος*.

⁵ The Cynic conception of Heracles as ideal suffering hero goes back to Antisthenes (D.L. 6.2). For further discussion see R. Hoistad, op. cit., pp. 28ff. et passim.

Vis isto divina descendit. Animum excellentem... caelestis potentia agitat. Non potest res tanta sine adminiculo numinis stare (Ep. 41.1-2 and 4).¹

But the divine spark needs to be ignited, or, to use Seneca's analogy, the divine seed must be sown in a fertile (bona) mind before it can produce in its bearer divine qualities:

Miraris hominem ad deos ire? Deus ad homines venit, immo quod est propius, in homines venit: nulla sine deo mens bona est. Semina in corporibus humanis divina dispersa sunt, quae si bonus cultor excipit, similia origini prodeunt et paria iis ex quibus orta sunt surgunt: si malus, non aliter quam humus sterilis ac palustris necat ac deinde creat purgamenta pro frugibus (Ep. 73.16).²

It is clear from these passages of Seneca that the divine element in man provided only the potential for him to become divine. It follows, therefore, that everyone should cultivate the god within. Accordingly Epictetus writes that man should in all his actions be aware that he is a fragment of god and carries god about with him:

οὐ δὲ ποιγούμενον εἶ, οὐ ἀπόσπασμα εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ· ἔχεις τε ἐν σεαυτῷ μέρος ἑκείνου (Diatr. 2.8; 11-12 and 18-19).³ The true Stoic, he

says, is a man whose soul desires to be at one with god (ὁμογνωμονήσαι τῷ θεῷ). "In plain words", he continues, "one who has set his heart upon changing from a man into a god (θεὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιθυμοῦντα γενέσθαι) and who in this dead body has resolved upon communion with god". Such a man Epictetus would be shown by those Stoics who failed to practise what they preached (Diatr. 2.19, 26-27).

The fact that god was present in some mysterious form in all men meant to Marcus Aurelius that it was possible for someone to be a θεῖος ἀνὴρ without the recognition of his contemporaries: λίαν

¹Cf. Ep. 44.1 omnes, si ad originem primam revocantur, a dis sunt.

²A. S. L. Farquharson, op. cit., I pp. 291ff., compares Manilius 2.107 quem denique in unum/descendit deus atque habitat, seque ipse requirit and Lucan 9.563 Ille (Cato) deo plenus, tacita quem mente gerebat. For this in Dio Chrys. see Or. 23.7.

³Cf. 1.14 ἐπίτροπον ἑκάστῳ παρέστησε τὸν ἑκάστου δαίμονα κτλ. See also 1.3 for the idea that god is the father of all men (cf. 1.13; 3.22).

γὰρ ἐνδέχεται θεῶν ἄνδρα γενέσθαι καὶ ὑπὸ μηδενὸς γνωρισθῆναι (7.67; cf. 5.5). But he insists that τὸ εὐδαιμόνως βιώσασθαι was in the grasp of only a few (7.67) and that only good men care for the inner deity (τῆρεν τὸν ἔνδον δαίμονα --3.16, 2-4).¹ Hence the good man is called ἱερεὺς τίς . . . καὶ ὑπουργὸς θεῶν (3.4, 3). For no good man can or will overrule his own θεὸς καὶ δαίμων (5.10). Moreover, the man who lives his life according to the guidance and directions of his apportioned δαίμων lives with the gods (σὺν θεοῖς --5.27).²

In this chapter I have contrived a logical progression of philosophical thought on the divine man. First a king and divine by right of birth, he becomes the perfect wise man who is divine by nature. But the living examples of divine kings always fall short of genuine divine qualities and the perfectus sapiens is for most men an unattainable ideal. Thus the notion is presented that all men can achieve divinity not by birth or nature but by a supreme effort to awaken the divine spark already within themselves. All this has some significance for the later concept of the Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος. Most important is the often recurring phrase θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις, words which carry greater meaning in the philosophers than in the poets and which help to prepare the way for the Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος of the first two centuries A.D. Again the ideal king or statesman and the ideal sage share with the Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος a general concern for mankind and a special concern for the soul.³ And each one has himself attained ethical perfection.

¹This "inner deity" is first mentioned in 2.13. Cf. the expressions ὁ ἔνδον ἐδρῦμενος δαίμων (3.4, 4; 3.16, 12) and ὁ ἐν σοὶ θεός (3.5).

²In 5.27 Marcus Aurelius calls the δαίμων an ἀπόσπασμα of god (cf. Epictet. Diatr. 2.8) and identifies it with νοῦς καὶ λόγος. Generally the precise nature of the δαίμων is left uncertain. But whether it is an indwelling deity which has come from the outside or the higher rational self distinguished from the senses, Marcus always assigns it the status of a semi-mystical object of veneration and worship. See A. S. L. Farquharson, Marcus Aurelius: His Life and his World ed. D. A. Rees (Oxford, 1951), pp. 133f.

³The Stoic sage is concerned to serve mankind, but he is never anxious or compassionate on their behalf (thereby disturbing his equanimity). See E. R. Bevan, Stoics and Sceptics (Oxford, 1913), pp. 66f.

There are essential differences too. Ethical qualities are asserted more vigorously than superhuman knowledge and achievements. With Apollonius of Tyana there is, if anything, an anti-rational regression to the magic practised by primitive god-men. This is to be coupled with the resuscitation of religious language in the later period. Perhaps the divine epithets in the philosophers are little more than verbal superlatives in comparison with the greater religious meaning of these terms for later *Θεῶν ἑνσώματα*. Lastly, the philosophical discussion has been about ideals. With Apollonius, however, the concept of god-man has suddenly become real and taken on human form. It is time now to examine the claims of Philostratus concerning the devout missionary of Pythagorean puritanism.

PART TWO

GOD-MAN IN LATER GRAECO-ROMAN LITERATURE

CHAPTER V

PHILOSTRATUS (1) PORTRAIT OF A DIVINE MAN

It is fairly easy even from the briefest reading of his biography to be impressed with the saintly standing of Apollonius of Tyana in a pagan world for the most part corrupt. One purpose of this thesis will be to show that there existed in the lifetime of Philostratus a conventional stock of material which could freely be drawn upon by biographers of the exceptionally holy religious leader or teacher. In this chapter we shall break down the Bild into its component parts; we shall see in isolation the multifarious elements which together convey to the reader a notion, whatever it may mean, that Apollonius was a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.

An obvious beginning will be made with the man himself and the assertions he makes about the nature of his being. Closely allied to these will be the opinions and conclusions of others who knew or had met Apollonius. After establishing both a claim to possess a godlike nature and the recognition of it by other men, we shall consider how the events and circumstances of the sage's life support the same idea. Also to be taken into account are those features which, though they do not in themselves testify to a direct relationship with god, are nevertheless significant for the formulation of the general concept of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.

Claim and Recognition

Claim

Nowhere does Philostratus make Apollonius refer to himself as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. But while talking to the Egyptian gymnosophists he does call the Indian Brahmins *θεῖοι* (6.11);¹ and in his Apology

¹References are to the Teubner text of C. L. Kayser (Leipzig, 1870) followed by F. C. Conybeare in the ed. of the Loeb Classical Library (London, 1912).

before Domitian he refers to a letter of Vespasian as ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ γενναίου τε καὶ θείου ἀνδρός (8.7,iii), and soon afterwards calls upon θεῖος Πυθαγόρας to defend him (8.7,iv).

A personal claim to be more than human may be found in only two passages. In 8.5, where the trial and acquittal before Domitian is related, Philostratus mentions among the sage's final remarks a quotation (not acknowledged) from the *Iliad* in which Apollo says to Achilles: οὐ γὰρ με κτενέεις, ἐπεὶ οὗτοι μόρσιμός εἰμι (Il.22.13). With these very words Apollonius is said to have disappeared from the court.

In the Apology, which according to Philostratus Apollonius was ready, if necessary, to deliver, an argument is given along philosophical grounds to support the apparent recognition of Apollonius by certain people as a god (8.7,vii). This amounts to a claim, if only a tacit one, on Apollonius's part to be a godlike man. He speaks of a certain kinship between man and god which enables man alone both to recognize the gods and to speculate about his own nature and how it participates in the divine. Furthermore all that is excellent (ἀρέτα) comes from god, and men who share in this excellence are ἀγαθοὶ θεοῦ τε [εἶναι] καὶ θείου. It was Apollo, he says, who first taught this view when he was at a loss how to address the Spartan Lycurgus and finally called him a god "since he was a good man"; yet the Spartans found no fault with Lycurgus for claiming immortality. It is further argued that the purpose of god in creating all things was his goodness, and that good men have in their nature something of god (θεοῦ τε ἔχειν).

The implications for Apollonius in all this are taken one step further. Just as the natural order of things is dependent upon god, so there is another kind of order (κόσμος) which depends on the good man. This is the world of undisciplined souls, of lawless and profligate men, of drunkards and blasphemers, a world which, he says, stands in need of a man who resembles a god (ἀνδρὸς θεῷ εἰκασμένου). Indeed it is a man chosen by god who must care for this world, a man who is himself a god sent (to mankind) by wisdom (θεὸς ὑπὸ σοφίας ἤκων). That Apollonius would regard himself as such a human saviour is made perfectly clear from what follows. He goes on to suggest that such a man could even restrain would-be murderers, but asserts with authority that, on the other hand, to cleanse a murderer of his guilt was neither in his power nor in that

of god who created all things (8.7, vii).

To place unequivocal belief in these passages as true words of the historical Apollonius would involve an obvious danger. The very clear motive of Philostratus in writing his eulogy was for posterity to recognize in the man an element of divinity. The earliest statement of this is in 1.2 where he promises to relate the events by means of which Apollonius achieved recognition as "a supernatural and godlike being" (δαίμονιός τε καὶ θεός). At 1.9 he feels he must not omit what happened while the sage was living in the temple of Asclepius "in the course of describing the life of a man held in honour even by the gods". But whether or not words were put into Apollonius's mouth in order to strengthen Philostratus's case is not important here.¹ At this stage our concern is with the contents of the portrait, not with the motives behind it.

It may, however, be profitable to include here evidence in support of a divine claim from the collection of Apollonius's letters.² In the forty-eighth letter, to Diotimus, he speaks of two (opposing) accounts in circulation about him and compares himself in this respect to Pythagoras, Orpheus, Plato, and Socrates. There is no need for surprise, he continues, for the same is true even of god himself; in any case, good men will naturally accept what is true as bad men equally will accept the opposite. What then follows is of extreme significance:

Τοσοῦτο μόνον δίκαιον ὑπομνήσαι περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ τὸ νῦν,
ὅτι περὶ ἑμοῦ καὶ θεοῖς εἴρηται ὡς περὶ θεοῦ
ἀνδρός, οὐ μόνον ἰδίᾳ τισὶ πολλάκις, ἀλλὰ καὶ δημοσίᾳ.
Ἐπαχθεὶς λέγειν τε περὶ αὐτοῦ πλείον ἢ μείζον.

Not only has Apollonius based his claim to be a θεός ἀνὴρ on the words of the gods ("on many occasions and to numerous men") but he seems also to think that it would be offensive to say more of himself-- incidentally making it plain that, if necessary, he was able to do so.

In letter 44, to his brother, Apollonius writes, perhaps with disappointment, that whereas some men regard him as the equal of the

¹For this see below, pp. 145ff.

²On the nature and authenticity of these letters see below, pp. 142ff.

Needless to say, Philostratus did not compose them; but he certainly knew of their existence and may have used a larger collection.

gods (ἰσοθέος) and others even as a god, his own country, for whom in particular he had endeavoured to be illustrious, ignores him. This cannot be surprising, for even his own family has failed to realize that he is "superior to many men in what he says and does".

Recognition

So much for the words of Apollonius. Whatever personal claim may have been made, he was positively recognized as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ not only by Damis, his faithful companion, and Philostratus, his eulogist, but by countless others whom he met in the course of his travels over the earth.

Damis,¹ his fellow-traveller, is bound to have seen something very special in Apollonius. He is said simply to have joined him at Nineveh, probably as a pupil. So great is his admiration for Apollonius that he wants to accompany him on the road, claiming that his knowledge of the itinerary and languages may prove useful. Apollonius replies, much to Damis' surprise, that he himself knows all languages without having learnt one, and also understands "whatever men keep silent about" (1.19).² Damis' immediate response is one of adoration: προσήύξατο αὐτόν... καὶ ὡς περ δαίμονα ἔβλεπε (*ibid.*).

His own wisdom increased as he stayed with Apollonius, and he committed to memory whatever he learnt. He determined to record every single word of the sage, even his most casual remarks, so that nothing about Apollonius should go unknown. So ardent was his devotion that when someone likened him to a dog eating up the scraps as they fall from tables, he replied, "if the gods have banquets and take food, they will surely have attendants who see to it that not even the drops of ambrosia are lost on the floor" (1.19).

During their sojourn with the Brahmins Damis tells Iarchus that when he first met Apollonius, he thought him to be full of wisdom and in some degree superhuman (δαίμονιόν τί μοι ἐγένετο --3.43).

In prison at Rome, when almost all hope was lost, Apollonius miraculously took his leg out of the chains as proof of his freedom both then and in the court on the following day. And Damis says

¹On the controversial issues which surround this character see below, pp. 153ff.

²This will mean that Apollonius was a mind-reader.

that for the first time he really understood the true nature of the sage, namely that it was godlike and superhuman (ὅτι θεία τε εἶη καὶ κρείττων ἀνθρώπου --7.38).¹

Among the other incidents of recognition some concern local regions or groups of people, and others result from individual encounters.

Hard by the very meadow where Apollonius is said to have been miraculously born a shrine had been erected by the local inhabitants (1.5).² There is near Tyana a well sacred to Zeus Orkios, and, according to Philostratus, the people of that region say that Apollonius was a son of this Zeus (1.6).

When he arrived at Alexandria the people gazed at him as if he were a god (θεῶ ἴσα) and gave way before him as he left his ship (5.24). He was similarly venerated at Rome where men were especially struck by the "godlike" quality of his appearance (7.31).³ All Greece flocked to see him after his escape from Rome, and when details of the law-court episode were learnt from certain Italians, the Greeks were disposed all but to worship him, thinking that he was θεῖος precisely because he made no boast about his escape (8.15).

It was, of course, a clause in the indictment against him at Rome that to some he was an object of worship (7.11, 20, 21). In the sixty-second letter of our collection the Spartans officially honour Apollonius as a citizen of their state and set up to him a bronze statue together with an inscription. Their forefathers, it said, regarded as sons of Lycurgus all who lived their lives in harmony with the will of the gods.

Individuals often recognize Apollonius as godlike on account of some word or action on his part. On the frontiers of Babylon he was met by a satrap who was so startled by his dried and parched look that he asked him where he came from and who sent him "as if he were talking to a spirit" (δαίμων). After a while, the man

¹Cf. 8.13 where Damis relates the incident to Demetrius at Dicaearchia (...θεσπέσιόν τε εἶναι αὐτὸν καὶ κρείσσω τῆς ἡμεδαπῆς σοφίας); cf. 7.22 where the reassured Damis προσκυνήσας... ἔφη κτλ.

²For the statue in this shrine see 8.29.

³Cf. 1.35 where at Babylon "everyone looked at him and wondered at his bearing."

was astonished that Apollonius needed no interpreter and he became more civil. When he learned the sage's name, immediate recognition took place:... *θεῖε Ἀπολλώνιε· πάλαι γάρ σε ἠκούομεν* (1.21).¹ Another satrap told the elders of the city that Apollonius "refused to do obeisance and that he was not in the least like an ordinary human" (1.28).²

Vardanes, king of Babylon, recommends the sage to his friend, a satrap of the Indus, who, in turn, writes to his own king, begging him not to treat with less respect than Vardanes "a man who was Greek and godlike" (2.17). Then Phraotes, the Indian king, writes to Iarchus, chief of the Brahmins, asking him to treat Apollonius as one not inferior to himself and to welcome his company as followers of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* (2.40). The Indian sages do welcome him as such, and in the presence of a third king--one who ruled in that region-- Iarchus drinks a toast to Apollonius, indicating by a gesture of the hand that he was *γενναῖός τε καὶ θεῖος* (3.28). They talk of divination, and Iarchus says that this is a gift from the gods; all mantics were therefore "godlike" and worked for the salvation of men; nor was it surprising that Apollonius possessed this knowledge since he carried in his soul so much *διθύρη* (3.42). As he was departing, the Indians declared that Apollonius would be esteemed a god by ordinary people, in life as well as in death (3.50).

He was considered superhuman even by his enemies. Tigellinus, Nero's minister, was so impressed by the lofty tone of Apollonius's replies that he regarded these as supernatural and beyond human knowledge (*δαίμονιά τε εἶναι καὶ πρόσω ἀνθρώπου*--4.44). He was careful not to fight with a god (*θεομαχεῖν*), and so declared, "Go wherever you wish. You are too powerful to be controlled by me" (*ibid.*). Similarly Domitian was so astonished at Apollonius's appearance that he said to his consul, "Aelian, you have brought a demon before me (7.32).

Two final cases are noteworthy. Vespasian, encouraged by Apollonius to become emperor, says, "I follow your advice because

¹ *πάλαι γάρ* explains the appellation *θεῖε*.

² Cf. 1.31 where the king immediately picks out Apollonius from the crowd and is reminded of his brother's report that the sage was worshipped by serious people at Antioch.

I believe your every word to be divinely inspired" (5.36). Nilus, a young convert among the Egyptian gymnosophists, speaks of Apollonius as sent by some god to help him taste the wisdom of India (6.16; cf. 1.28). What is here expressed is something more than Greek idiom for "a piece of good luck". For the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is a man sent by god as his representative with a definite mission to perform.

Superhuman Powers and Knowledge

The personal claim to possess a godlike nature and the recognition of this by others is confirmed by the possession of knowledge and powers which distinguished Apollonius from other men as being superhuman. These fall readily into three categories: the knowledge of mysteries and secrets hidden from the rest of mankind, the knowledge of past and future events, and knowledge that enables one to perform visible wonders.

Knowledge of secret things

Under this heading there are three sorts of secret knowledge. First, there is the knowledge of how religious ceremonies are to be performed and how dreams and portents are to be interpreted. In particular, Apollonius seems to have used his own private rites known to no one else except, perhaps, the Indians.¹ A typical day in his life began with the performance alone of observances which he eventually communicated to those of his disciples who had undergone a four year period of silence (1.16). While staying with the Babylonian king, he refused to join in the sacrifice of a horse, but made his own offering of frankincense to the sun (1.31). On this occasion, and in Egypt while sacrificing a model bull (of frankincense) he claimed to see things revealed in the fire (5.25).

At Nineveh he "showed greater understanding" of Io's image than did the priests and prophets (1.19), and at Olympia he did the same for the statue of Milo (4.28). Moreover, at Gadeira in Spain, he deciphered and interpreted an unknown inscription on pillars in the temple of Heracles, thus explaining what priests would (or could) not tell (5.5).

¹5.30 (end)--"After their conversation A. left the emperor (Vesp.) saying that the customs of India forbade him to do anything at noon which the Indians did not do".

When Apollonius was not far from Babylon, a god is said to have sent him a dream in which fish cast on to dry land had in their misery called for help to a dolphin swimming nearby. After humorously suggesting to Damis that this was a bad omen, he explained the real meaning to be that certain Eretrians, whom Darius had taken captive some five hundred years before, were in need of a helper in that foreign land (1.23f.). In another dream, experienced when about to embark upon a journey to Italy, Apollonius was advised by a tall and elderly woman, claiming to be the nurse of Zeus, first to pay her a visit. He concluded that he ought to go to Crete, where Zeus was born (4.34).

In his capacity as seer the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* can also predict the future through augury and portent. Thus from the portent of a three-headed child Apollonius foresees the short reigns of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius (5.13); and from the discovery of a dead lioness with eight unborn cubs he predicts the length of his stay with Vardanes (1.22).¹

A second category of mysterious knowledge is the knowledge of Nature's secrets. Tides, for example, are understood to be set in motion under the influence of submarine spirits (5.2). Similar *πνεύματα*, and not Hephaestus, or the Giants, are the cause of volcanoes (5.14, 16-17). But Apollonius does not doubt that gods may make use of such natural events: an earthquake at Antioch was said to be the work of a god who was clearly anxious to reconcile the factions in that city (6.38).

In India he picked up a precious stone offered to him by King Phraotes and said, "O priceless gem, how opportunely I have found you, and not without god's help". Presumably, adds Philostratus, he had discovered in it some mysterious and divine power (2.40). On a more mundane level, Apollonius was able to persuade a man to invest all his capital in the purchase of an estate, on which he later found buried treasure (6.39).²

When at the river Hyphasis the party came across a piebald woman, the others were terrified to see such a *δείμα*, but

¹For similar portents cf. 4.34, 43; 8.23.

²Needless to say, the man who sold the property was utterly worthless!

Apollonius took her by the hand and realized that she was dedicated to Aphrodite (3.3). He knew how to deal with the ghost of a satyr which plagued the women of an Ethiopian village. This knowledge, admittedly, comes from the legendary Midas, who used wine for the purpose. However, it was by secret rebukes that he summoned the satyr, and he knew in what cave it would later be found asleep (6.27).

Thirdly, Apollonius is endowed with knowledge of a more mysterious kind. A true Pythagorean, he is aware of his former lives. Perhaps this was how he understood all languages without having learnt a single one (1.19). At all events, he related to the Indian sages how he had previously been the pilot of an Egyptian ship (3.23f.).

He could also recognize the souls of former men in dumb animals. At Alexandria he came across a tame lion which lived on a bloodless diet and even drank wine. The lion fawned upon Apollonius as he was sitting in a temple. The sage informed bystanders who thought that it wanted some food that the lion was really begging him to reveal whose soul it was. He told them that this was the soul of Amasis,¹ a former king of the Saite dynasty in Egypt. At this the lion gave a pitiful roar (5.42).

At Tarsus a mad dog had bitten a youth causing him to behave just like a dog himself. Thirty days later, when Apollonius arrived on the scene, he gave an accurate description of the dog and where it was to be found.² Damis is instructed to lead the dog to Apollonius, saying only that he summons it. The animal crouches beneath the sage's feet and whimpers like a suppliant. He strokes it, proclaims it to be the soul of Mysian Telephus, and bids it lick the boy's wound, which duly heals (6.43).³

¹Amasis reigned 570-526 B.C. See Hdt. 2.155ff.

²The "pause" before this description allows for telepathic exertion to take place in Apollonius's mind.

Telephus, of course, was wounded by Achilles and, in accordance with an oracle, healed by the rust of the same spear, wounder thus proving healer.

Knowledge of past and future events

It is evident from what he says in letter 69 that Apollonius possessed the faculty of physiognomy:

τὰς φύσεις οὖν ἑνὸς ἑκάστου διεύρομαι καὶ τοὺς τρόπους, ὡς ἔνι
μάλιστα συνετώτατα, τό τε πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν ἑκάστου δίκαιον
ἦθος ἢ τούναντίον.

Here it is to mark whether each man's disposition towards his city is just or the reverse. By the same means he could read a man's character in general. He discerned, for example, that Menippus at Corinth was hunted by women:

Ὁ δὲ... ἀνδριαντοποιοῦ δίκην ἐς τὸν Μένιππον βλέπων ἐβυγράφη
τὸν νεανίαν καὶ ἐθεώρει, καταγνούς δὲ αὐτόν, κτλ.
(4.25).

Similar remarkable incidents may be explained more properly by telepathy. Brief examples are the detection of a spy in Domitian's prison (7.27), the predicted acquittal of one of twelve condemned men (5.24), the condemnation of a lavish sacrificer at Aegae after the mention of only his name (1.10), the prior account to the companions of the past life of Timasion (6.3) and of the suppliant among the Egyptian gymnosophists (6.5), and the disclosure to Aelian in Egypt of his name, parentage and country (8.18).

On other occasions Apollonius simply states what he knows to have happened. The prediction that Nero would not finish his Corinthian canal was accompanied by an assertion that the emperor had indeed already left Greece in panic (5.7). With prior knowledge of Vitellius's burning of the temple on the Capitol, he told Vespasian that he was destined to restore to Zeus "what only yesterday the hands of wicked men burnt down" (5.30). Similarly he realized that it was Euphrates who had turned the Egyptian sages and Domitian respectively against him (6.13; 7.36).

More miraculous is his knowledge of past events outside his own lifetime. This may take the form of some obscure, but authoritative, statement like, "Socrates did not die, but the Athenians thought he did" (8.12), or a matter-of-fact reference like the one about Megistias the Acarnanian, who at the battle of Thermopylae "knew what was to be suffered and was eager to share in it with brave men, fearing not death, but the prospect of not dying in such company" (4.23).¹

¹Megistias was a diviner. See Aelian NH 8.5, p.322

Knowledge of an immediate past event is also attested. At Ephesus, where in the temple cloisters Apollonius was teaching the principles of mutual support, he was suddenly interrupted by the loud chirping of a sparrow which had now joined a group of sparrows hitherto quietly perched on the neighbouring trees. Soon all flew off together after this first one. Apollonius, meanwhile, continued with his teaching until he noticed his audience still looking in the direction of the sparrows. Thereupon he explained that a boy had just spilled a bowl of barley on the ground and had failed to gather all of it up; and a sparrow which had seen this happen had come there to invite its comrades to join in the good fortune. Most of the crowd immediately ran to where he said the incident had occurred, and they returned "talking loudly and full of wonder" (4.3). The marvel, incidentally, provides a visual aid to Apollonius's lesson on communism!¹

Parallel to this passage is the vision of Domitian's assassination in Rome, which at the same moment in time "appeared" to Apollonius at Ephesus. It is a prime example of telepathic second sight and again worth quoting in detail (8.26). At midday Apollonius was giving an address, when at first he lowered his voice, as if alarmed, and then began to talk like one who had his mind on other things. Finally he stopped, and, staring straight onto the ground, stepped three or four paces forward and cried out, "Strike the tyrant, strike him". He paused, as if he were waiting to see the result of some action, and then continued, "Take heart, gentlemen, for today, in fact this very minute, the tyrant has been slain". No one had the courage to believe him, but he persisted that, although Rome herself was as yet unaware, even now the rumour was spreading and thousands were leaping for joy.²

We have considered knowledge of the past, and knowledge of the present in time but distant in place. Foreknowledge of future

¹In 1.20 Philostratus comments on the cleverness of Apollonius in learning from the Arabs the language of animals. At 2.11, 14-16 he knows the mind of elephants. Cf. the dog and lion (6.43; 5.42 and above, P.108). For a case of human mind-reading cf. 3.10; 1.19.

²Cf. Dio Cassius 67.18 where it seems likely that Dio is quoting the words of Apollonius from a different source (i.e. not Philostratus). See also below, pp. 129f.

events must now be taken up: First, Apollonius is well acquainted with natural disasters before they occur. At Ephesus he warned the people of an imminent plague, but to their later misfortune they took no notice (4.4). Also in Ionia he foresaw and tried to avert the ruin which earthquakes were to cause in various cities (4.6). Twice he predicted sea-storms and shipwreck: once when he sent Damis by land to where they were to meet after the trial (7.41), and on another occasion when he providently changed from a Sicilian to a Greek vessel at Leucas (5.18).

With characteristic prescience he knew the day both of his own and of other men's deaths. Threatened with murder as a young man by a vicious Cilician, Apollonius answered him by naming a certain day. Three days later the Cilician was executed for treason (1.12). He commended the emperor Titus for wanting to know against whom he ought most to be on his guard, and replied that first he should watch his father's bitterest foes and later his own immediate family. The sage added that he was about to make this clear in any case and, for good measure, predicted the manner of Titus's death as being like that of Odysseus (6.32).¹ Apollonius declined Nerva's invitation for him to be his adviser with the enigmatical reply: "We will be together, my king, for a very long time, when neither we shall rule others nor others us." He had thus anticipated both their impending deaths (8.27).

He predicted that Vespasian would become emperor, and that Nero would not finish his canal at Corinth (5.31; 4.24). He may have foreseen the revolt of Vindex (5.10).² He knew that the reigns of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius would be short both by means of a portent and earlier by his own inspiration. He also stated that two of these would die in Rome, the other in a neighbouring country (5.11, 13).³

On a more personal level, when a priest of Eleusis was at first reluctant to initiate him, Apollonius foretold the name of a future priest who would accept him upon his return (4.18; 5.19). In Babylon

¹Odysseus' death was connected with the sea. One account mentions a fish-bone. In Titus's case it was to be by eating poisoned fish.

²This is Philostratus's interpretation of a remark to the governor of Baetica: "Farewell, and remember Vindex."

³Otho died in Gaul.

Damis was told that on the next day he would learn that even eunuchs fall in love. On the morrow a misbehaving eunuch was found in the king's private quarters (1.33, 36).

Power to perform visible wonders

The knowledge that enables Apollonius to perform visible wonders takes on three forms: the power of healing, the power to fight against evil spirits, and the power to perform phenomenal wonders on or of one's person.

Often the wonder is followed by a "conversion".¹ At Aegae, for example, Apollonius cured a young man suffering from dropsy by telling him to cease from self-indulgence. This, says Philostratus, was a clear interpretation of Heracleitus's unintelligible remark, when, similarly afflicted, the Ephesian asked his doctors if they were competent to create a drought after a flood (1.9).²

It has been noted already how a mad dog was ordered to lick a boy's wound and thus restore him to health (6.43 and above, p.108). Nor did Apollonius neglect the dog. After a prayer, he sent it across the river, and it was plain to all that the draught of water had cured it. Here, as elsewhere, Apollonius seems to possess a numen powerful in its effect upon dumb creatures.³

Far more sensational is the one instance where Apollonius performs the ultimate wonder--the raising of a dead person (4.45). At Rome a young bride of consular family had died on the eve of her wedding and the whole city practically was in mourning. Apollonius made the cortège halt, for he would stop their tears. He asked for the name of the girl, and the crowd expected a funeral oration from him. In fact he simply touched her, pronounced some secret utterance, and woke her up from apparent death. The girl gave out a cry and returned to her father's house, and Apollonius refused any monetary gift. Philostratus sensibly makes one further point: neither he, nor any of those present, could decide whether the sage detected some spark of life still within her--it was raining

¹See also below, pp. 119f.

²For Heracleitus see Diog. Laert. 9.3 (ἐξ ἐπομβρίας ἀύχρον ποιῆσαι).

³See below, p. 117.

and steam rose from her face--or whether he actually restored her dead body to life. In either case, it was an event which defied explanation.¹

In 6.41 the cure takes the form of a fight against natural disasters. The Hellespont once shook with earth tremors, and Apollonius not only drove out Egyptian and Chaldaean impostors who were demanding payment for their remedies, but also understood the causes of this divine wrath and successfully made the appropriate offerings in each case at little expense.

More frequently, however, Apollonius is fighting against evil spirits and the powers of darkness. So when at Ephesus he threatened an approaching plague with the words "you are not to come here" and similar expressions, it was no frivolous bombast (4.4). For the cause of the plague turned out to be a *δαίμων*² in a beggar's disguise. At first the citizens were appalled at Apollonius's instruction to stone the blind mendicant, who all this time was begging for mercy. But he persisted, and when one or two began to hurl stones, the beggar suddenly opened his eyes and they were seen to be full of fire. At once a shower of stones was hurled upon him, and when these were removed and the body uncovered, it was found to be that of a Molossian hound the size of a lion. A statue of Heracles the Averter stands near the spot where the "demon" had been slain (4.10).

Apollonius encountered another evil spirit when once he was talking of libations. He recognised it in the coarse laughter of a notorious young libertine (4.20). As the sage looked at him, the phantom (*εἰδωλον*) began to shriek within the man as if on the rack. It swore to leave the youth and never take possession of any other man. But Apollonius continued to be enraged and ordered it to show by a clear sign that it had departed out of that body. As a proof of this a statue was to be thrown to the ground. Philostratus writes that, when this happened, it was impossible to describe the uproar which followed; men even clapped their hands in amazement. The youth, on the other hand, rubbed his eyes, as if he had just woken from sleep and gave up his licentious ways for a life of philosophy.³

¹The spectacular healings which occur at the castle of the Brahmins may not be discussed here. In each case it is an Indian, and not Apollonius, who performs the cure (3.38-40).

²It is also called a *φάσμα* (4.10).

³For "conversion" as a feature of the life of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* see also below, p.119.

What Philostratus judges to be the most famous story concerning Apollonius well illustrates the power of good over evil. This is the narrative of Apollonius's adventure with a vampire at Corinth (4.25).¹ A young disciple, named Menippus, of the philosopher Demetrius had fallen in love with a strange woman of great beauty and charm. Apollonius was invited to the marriage-feast, but he immediately denounced the bride as an empusa and the silver, gold, and other fineries as phantoms. At first the woman rebuked the sage and pretended to be disgusted, but when before the reproaches of Apollonius all the fine tableware and servants proved illusory and vanished from sight, she seemed to weep and begged him not to torment her or force her to confess what she was. He persisted until a confession was wrung from her that she was a vampire who was fattening up Menippus only later to devour him.

The travellers fell in with another empusa on the journey from Babylon to India (2.4).² This apparition took on various forms, sometimes disappearing altogether. Apollonius understood what it was and knew how to deal with it. He instructed his followers to curse it violently, upon which the thing fled howling like a ghost.

Other physical wonders of a more phenomenal nature are restricted to Apollonius's own person and serve his own needs from time to time. In this light we may see the "wonder-journeys" undertaken over great distances in a single moment of time. When summoned to Ephesus to scotch the plague, he has only to consent, and that very instant he has arrived (εἰπὼν Ἰωμεν, ἦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ --4.10). Philostratus immediately recalls the miracle of Pythagoras, who was in Thurii (sic) and Metapontum at one and the same time. Similarly Apollonius travelled from Rome to Dicaearchia (Puteoli) in the space of an afternoon (8.10). When asked for an explanation, he told Demetrius and Damis to imagine what they liked, so long as they ascribed it to god (8.12).

He possessed the powers of a conjuror too. He was able to baffle his first prosecutor at Rome by causing him to unravel his

¹The vampire is called various things (ἔμπουσα, φάσμα, ὄφις, λάμια, μορμολύκεια). Lamia is adopted by Keats for his poem of the same title. The story is also recounted by Robert Burton in Anatomy of Melancholy (1621). Cf. also Goethe's poem Die Braut von Korinth.

²Philostratus calls this a φάσμα ἐμπούσης.

scroll only to find it completely blank (4.44). Later, after his acquittal before Domitian, he "vanished" from the court (8.5) in a manner described later as *δαμόνιον τε καὶ οὐ βλάβειον εἶπεῖν τρόπον* (8.8). By a similar trick he reassured Damis in a Roman prison: his leg miraculously stepped out of its chains and was placed back again (7.39).¹

Two further episodes display powers of communication with the underworld. Apollonius conversed with the ghost of Achilles, not, like Odysseus, by means of a blood-trench, but after the Indian fashion of approaching heroes with a prayer (4.11, 16). He descended the cave of Trophonius in Lebadea in order to ask what was the purest and most perfect philosophy, and emerged at Aulis with a volume of Pythagoras (8.19).

Close Relationship with God

The source of this superhuman knowledge and power is for Apollonius to be found in India. In a letter (quoted by Philostratus) expressing gratitude to the Brahmins for sharing with him their knowledge he confesses that they had endowed him with power to travel through the sky (*διὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πορεύεσθαι*--3.51). Whether levitation or astral travel is meant, this certainly accounts for the examples of bilocation. In this same letter Apollonius asserts that he will communicate with the wise men by words as if they were present--referring, I dare say, to an ancient form of telephony by thought transference.

On the other hand, the possibility of sorcery and magic in all this does present itself. The question had arisen in Philostratus's time no less fiercely than it should to the serious inquirer today. Only if the feats of wonder can be seen as the direct consequence of a close relationship to the gods and not as dependent on wizardry, will Apollonius rightly be called a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.²

Evidence for this kinship, from Philostratus at least, is overwhelming. A sharp distinction is observable between the initiated

¹Earlier Apollonius had told the emperor's spy that he could endure the burden of his chains because his mind was on other matters and that a man of his sort will either feel no pain or order it to stop (7.36). No one today is unfamiliar with the power of mind over matter.

²The *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* and *γόνις* may not have been clearly distinguished in the ancient world. More needs to be said in a later chapter on Philostratus's demarcation. See below, pp.190f.

and the profane.¹ When asked by Telesinus about his wisdom, Apollonius calls it an inspiration (θειασμός) which teaches men how to pray and sacrifice to the gods (4.40). To Phraotes he calls himself a fit receptacle of the gods (θεοφόρητος)² because he drinks water not wine (2.37). This enables him better to interpret dreams, an art which is considered the most godlike (θειότατον) of human achievements (*ibid.*). Indeed it is insisted throughout that precognition is wholly the result of divine revelation.³ Furthermore, the art of healing is said by Iarchus to be dependent upon prophecy; for Asclepius learnt how to make drugs from his father Apollo's oracles and responses; nor would anyone have dared to use deadly poison in medicine without prognostic wisdom (3.44). So close was the relationship in which Apollonius stood to the divine that Philostratus went so far as to compare the episodes in his life to the visitations of Asclepius's own sons (6.35). The notion requires a closer scrutiny.

Divine favour: Χάρις

Philostratus tells us that even the gods held Apollonius in high esteem (1.9). In his youth spent at the temple of Asclepius, the god told the priest one day "that he was pleased to be curing the sick when Apollonius was present" (1.8).⁴ To the same priest at night Asclepius verified Apollonius's condemnation of a one-eyed lavish sacrificer (1.10). When asked by a wicked governor of Cilicia to be recommended to the god, the young sage replied that it was on account of his καλοκάγαθία that he had become servant and companion to Asclepius (1.12). On his return from India he was welcomed by the oracles of Greece, Colophon, Didyma, and Pergamum spoke of his perfect wisdom; and the god urged those in need of health to pay him a visit (4.1). At Rome Apollonius tells Nero's consul, Telesinus, that none of the gods object to his presence, but

¹ Often Damis is excluded from Apollonius's most secret conversations. In particular cf. 1.26; 3.12.

² Cf. 5.29 where Vespasian says *φασὶ γὰρ πλείστα σε τῶν θεῶν αἰσθάνεσθαι*.

³ Numerous examples of the Greek word used in this connection are quoted in Ch. VII, p. 184.

⁴ Cf. 8.19 where Trophonius rebukes his priests for opposing Apollonius.

all share their roof with him (4.40). Even Achilles' shade is pleased to have met him "having waited long for a man like yourself" (4.16).

A more specific charisma or special privilege was the protection of the gods in time of danger or opposition. The notoriously dangerous straits of Euboea were, according to Philostratus, unusually calm for the time of year, when Apollonius passed through them (4.15).¹ One is tempted here to think of a numen which brought under the sage's power not only men and animals but the elements as well. Apollonius knew that he was to suffer nothing at Rome, and Damis compares both of them to the shipwrecked Odysseus, whom Leucothea by means of her veil helped to dry land and safety (7.22; cf. Od. 5.333). It is further suggested that the reason for Domitian's inactivity after Apollonius had vanished from court was probably the realization of his own helplessness against the sage (8.8). Astonished at his sudden presence in the cave at Dicaearchia, Demetrius confesses that he always believed that some god was ever watching over his words and actions (8.12).

At 8.17 Apollonius is seen to be on the same footing with Zeus. As money is needed to defray travel expenditure, he goes into the temple at Olympia to ask the priest if Zeus would mind him taking a thousand drachmas out of the treasury. "He will be annoyed", replied the priest, "if you do not take more."

This divine charisma is linked with the consistent obedience of Apollonius to the will of god. When his followers were inclined to disapprove of an Indian journey, he replied, "The gods are my advisers, and I have told you their decision...I must go where wisdom and daimōn lead me" (1.18). Here and elsewhere the situation is regarded by him as a divinely ordained test for his disciples. The warnings of Philolaus in Italy he regarded as the greatest of blessings from the gods (4.37). To the eight who out of thirty-four stood by him here he advised first a prayer to the gods, since apart from them there was no other helper (4.38). So far as concerned Nero's proclamation prohibiting philosophy, they were to answer, like Antigone, that Zeus gave no such order (ibid.; cf. Soph. Antig. 450). The long journeys

¹"The currents of the Euripus at the narrows of Chalcis are the most famous in the Mediterranean." A. E. Zimmern, The Greek Commonwealth (Oxford, 1911), p.28 and n.2.

are often treated as a religious pilgrimage where every shrine and altar along the route is visited almost under compulsion (5.43; 4.14; 2.6).

Divine authority

The authority of his words and deeds, which seemed never to be challenged, also attests his divine nature. He spoke like one issuing oracles, and his words had about them the ring of sovereignty (1.17). His rival, Euphrates, is jealous because Vespasian shows Apollonius more interest than men who consult the gods for advice (5.33). His authoritative commands to the plague that threatened Ephesus (4.4) and the strange summons served on the mad dog (6.43) have already been noticed (above, p.108).¹ During his period of silence he came across a famine at Aspendus (1.15). Making his formal protest to the selfish corn merchants he wrote on a tablet:

ἡ γῆ πάντων μήτηρ (ἔστι), ... καὶ εἰ μὴ παύσεσθε,
οὐκ ἔδω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἔσταναι.

His authority is seen in other statements. He spoke of the Babylonian magi as being "wise but not altogether so" (1.26). In his condemnation of blood-offerings, he modestly believed that the gods shared his opinion (8.7, xii)! He firmly believed that he was not to die at the hands of a despot, not even if he wished to do so; he had in any case chosen a time to die, as was the duty of all philosophers (7.14; 31).

There was clear authority in the teachings and actions of Apollonius, especially in his role as reprover (see below, p.124). When asked how a wise man should converse, he replied, "Like a law-giver, whose duty it is to make for ordinary men laws about which he himself is strongly convinced" (1.17). Everywhere he went he gave authoritative instruction in the correct procedures for religious rites (3.58; 4.1, 11, 40). At Eleusis he suggested to the priest that the man's refusal to initiate him was chiefly because he knew more about those rites (4.18). In letter 26 he claims to know that the gods prefer wisdom to sacrifice.

The authority to forgive and purify also belongs to Apollonius. When he meets Timasion in Egypt, he promises to forgive all the evil he has done and commend the good (6.3) Not much later, using the

¹His treatment of ghouls and vampires is similar. Cf. 4.10, 25; 2.4; 6.27; and see above, p.114.

rites which Pythagoras and Empedocles prescribe for murder, he purifies the suppliant of the gymnosophists (6.5). Finally, it is almost as a mediator that Apollonius appears before Vespasian, when he prays on his behalf to Zeus (5.30).

Compelling influence upon others

The influence and reputation of Apollonius are to be seen as the result of a relationship with god. This is sometimes explicit; at other times at least, a sense of awe about the incident is perceptible.

Philostratus says that Vespasian, addressing Apollonius in the temple "as one saying a prayer", asked to be made king (5.28). In Domitian's prison everyone takes heart at the sage's words, and it is believed that while he is in their midst no one could suffer harm (7.26). These same men were overjoyed at Apollonius's unexpected return to them from confinement in chains (7.40). During his first stay at Rome, under Nero, his discourses resulted in a religious revival, and people flocked to wherever he was, in the hope of greater blessings from the gods (4.41). At Ilium in the autumn (when the sea was not to be trusted) men sought to share a voyage with Apollonius. Philostratus's conclusion was that they must have considered him to be master of the elements (4.13). On a different sea-journey when Apollonius leapt across from one ship to another without setting foot on dry land, his companions without a word jumped after him (5.21).

More specifically, the influence is of a transforming kind: it brings about conversion. By the wisdom of Apollonius not only is a young Spartan dissuaded from a sea-faring life (4.32), but when Spartan effeminacy in general is rebuked, an immediate revival wins generous praise (4.27). In Egypt Thespesian, leader of the naked sages, blushes at his words, and Nilus becomes his disciple (6.12). For similar reasons Titus wrote to him, "I have captured Jerusalem, you have captured me" (6.29).

Wise advice, it is true, need not be connected with a divine nature. However, there are times when the conversion is regarded as a wondrous deed. At Antioch Apollonius was said to have won over the most Philistine of people (1.17). When Damis became his associate, his wisdom increased, thus enabling him to remember everything he learnt (1.19). Apollonius talked about the soul to the sick king of Babylon οὐτω θεῖα so that upon his recovery the king told his attendants that now he despised both his kingdom and

death (1.37). The Indian king, who saw Apollonius as his superior, refused in his presence a jewelled crown (2.26, 27).

The conversion may be linked with a healing wonder. Thus the cured demoniac of 4.20 gave up his riotous living in order to don the cloak of a philosopher. A youth, obsessed with the idea of marrying a statue of Aphrodite, was cured of his blasphemous desire and left Apollonius in order to sacrifice and gain forgiveness (6.40).

Influence brings in its turn reputation and honours. Even in his younger days at Aegae everyone within travelling distance came to see Apollonius in the temple of Asclepius; he became the subject of the proverbial saying: "Where are you hurrying? Is it to see the boy?" (1.8). Throughout his life men left their business to go and see him (4.1). Followers and admirers were constantly present (4.47; 5.20, 43; 8.19, 21, 24). Vespasian in a letter to Titus calls him *εὐεργέτης* (6.30).¹ The people of Tarsus, in return for a favour won by him from Titus, honoured him as founder (*οἰκιστής*)² and mainstay of their city (6.34).

Remarkable birth and death

The accounts of both beginning and end of the life of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* are emblazoned with wonder. Just before Apollonius was born, the god Proteus appeared to his mother in the shape of an Egyptian *Σαίμων*. Unafraid she asked what sort of child she would bear. "Myself", the god answered, and told her who he was. At this point Philostratus reminds his reader of Proteus' reputation for wisdom and foreknowledge, and his versatility in eluding his would-be captors. Apollonius was to prove even greater (1.4).

His mother was also warned of the hour of her delivery. She was told in a dream to go into a meadow and pick flowers. Here she fell asleep and bore her child amid a chorus of singing swans. Local inhabitants claim that at the exact moment of birth a thunder-bolt which seemed about to fall to earth rose up into the sky and disappeared—a divine indication of Apollonius's future greatness on earth and his elevation to heaven (1.5).

Naturally, as a young boy Apollonius was conspicuous both for his beauty and his intelligence (1.7). He lived to be a very old

¹The term is familiar in the cults voted for Hellenistic rulers. See above, p.67.

²For this as a cult-title for founders of ancient cities see above, p.67.

man and, if anything, his good looks increased (8.29).¹

Death he desired to face alone and sent Damis away with advice, even if he has to be a philosopher all alone, to look at him (8.28). There were in fact several accounts of his death, "if he did die" (8.29). One version puts it at Ephesus with two handmaidens in attendance. Another tradition records his death at Lindus where, after entering the temple of Athene, he disappeared within. According to a more wondrous story, Apollonius was staying in Crete and visited the temple of Dictynna,² where the ferocious dogs which guarded the treasury fawned upon him even more than on their keepers. He was therefore arrested as a sorcerer and brigand; but at midnight he set himself free and, calling on his guards to witness the event, he ran to the temple, whose doors opened wide to receive him and closed after he had entered. From within, the voice of maidens could be heard singing: *στειχε γὰρ, στειχε ἐς οὐρανόν, στειχε* (8.30).

Finally it is related that Apollonius "appeared" to a doubting disciple, who was thus convinced of the soul's immortality. Evidently the youth had been praying for nine months that Apollonius would reveal to him the truth about the soul, but was now convinced that the sage was utterly dead. The appearance came five days later, when the young man chanced to have fallen asleep at his studies. He suddenly started up, still half asleep, and bellowed out an oracular message from the sage about the soul. No one else saw the vision (8.31).

Philostratus concludes his narrative by declaring that he could find no grave of Apollonius, although he had travelled over most of the earth. But everywhere he found supernatural stories about him (*λόγους δὲ πανταχοῦ δαιμονίους* --8.31). His shrine at Tyana was built by an emperor (*ibid.*).³

Contributory Features

This survey of material used by Philostratus in his portrait of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is almost complete. What evidence remains may have

¹When he died, he was either eighty, over ninety, or over one hundred years old. Statues of his wrinkled beauty were to be found in the temple at Tyana (8.29).

²I.e. Artemis at Cydonia. Cf. Hdt. 3.59.

³Caracalla. See Dio Cassius 77.18, 4

less intrinsic value for the superhuman type. It is adopted not to establish the divine nature of Apollonius's life, but rather to enrich the portrait of qualities already demonstrated. Features to be examined under this heading testify not to a superhuman being but to an extraordinary human being. In any event, it may not have been easy for Philostratus or any of his contemporaries to distinguish clearly what was extraordinary from what was superhuman. All the facts which contribute to the saintly standing of Apollonius in the ancient world were, no doubt, gratefully received and eagerly incorporated.

Character and personality

The character and personality of Apollonius was extraordinary in a number of ways. He surpassed his own teachers at a very early age; yet he showed genuine modesty in his willingness to learn the lore of the Brahmins, teachers of his advanced wisdom.¹ Though not uncompromisingly a hermit, he practised a Pythagorean asceticism, renouncing a diet of flesh and wine, wearing only a linen garment, and letting his hair grow long.² He resolved never to marry, and while even a young man he overcame the maddening passion of lust so that not even his enemy, Euphrates, accused him of sexual indulgence (1.13).³ Furthermore, he kept silence for five years (1.14). He was consistent in his religious devotion--praying three times daily to the sun--and above all in his outright condemnation of blood-shed.⁴

He displayed a miraculous contempt for wealth and glory. Insensible to the riches and splendour of the Babylonian palace, his prayer was, "Grant, O gods, that I possess little and want nothing" (1.33).⁵ He

¹1.7 (early teachers); 3.11-12, 16, 36-38 (Brahmins). Apollonius's book On Sacrifices was undertaken as a result of his conversations with Iarchus (3.41).

²1.8, 21,32; 2.7, 35-37; 4.40; 6.11; 7.15; 8.7, v. He did not require total abstinence of his followers (2.7).

³Cf. 6.42. For slander which Philostratus rejects see his VS 2.5.

⁴For Apollonius at prayer see 1.16; 2.38; 6.10, 18; 7.31 (dawn); 5.30; 6.14; 7.10 (noon); 8.13 (evening). For his views on blood-rites see 1.24, 31, 38; 4.11; 5.25; Letters 26, 27; the fragment of the treatise On Sacrifices preserved in Eusebius Praep. Ev. 4.13.

⁵Cf. 1.21, 30; Letters 85.

wished that wealth flourished less, equality more (6.2). Indeed, he spoke of wealth and virtue as two opposites and never took payment for teaching philosophy.¹ When the Spartans were eager to celebrate a theopany in his honour, he discouraged them for fear that such honours would arouse envy (4.31). Throughout his life he says that it was only the good name of Tyana that he sought to win (and for this he was duly honoured).² He wrote to Dion that single listeners were preferable to large audiences, the latter being attracted only by pride.³

Apollonius personified the Roman virtues of fortitudo and constantia. Philostratus mentions his courage in journeying through unconquered lands (1.20). Appropriately it is in Italy that Apollonius tells his timid followers in Stoic terms that a wise man is afraid of nothing on earth (4.38). Elsewhere Philostratus comments that it is hard for a man never to change; this, we are to understand, was the achievement of Apollonius (6.35). Consistency in his religious discipline has already been noted (above, p.122).

Finally under this heading belongs the moral loftiness of his sayings. Besides being authoritative, his words contained a wisdom, albeit commonplace, which caused lesser minds to marvel. He answers questions with exceptional sagacity. When asked what gift he should bring the Babylonian king from India, Apollonius replied that this would be his return as a wiser and better man (1.40). He told a spy in the Roman prison that his mission was to teach the emperor, who as yet did not know it, that he was *καλὸς κάγαθός* (7.36). The governor of Greece, who had asked him to interpret a heavenly sign, was informed that human wisdom did not meddle with the decisions of the gods; nevertheless, he reassured the man (8.23). He insisted on morality in religion and was convinced that the gods blessed the holy and condemned the wicked; and so he prayed, "O gods, grant me what I deserve" (1.11).

The letters of Apollonius to the philosopher, Musonius, some of which are quoted by Philostratus, were said to contain lofty themes (*τι μέγα* --4.46). To these may be added the separate collection

¹Letters 35; cf. 42, 48.

²Letters 47.

³Letters 10.

of letters, often in the form of apophthegms, which testify to the inspirational wisdom of the sage.¹

Teachings and service to mankind

Apollonius led the life of a religious missionary who travelled from place to place preaching a moral philosophy based largely on Pythagoras. He gained his reputation by championing the purity of bloodless ritual in religion (4.1, 5). Everywhere he inspected and reformed the rites used by priests in their temples (e.g. 1.16; 4.19, 24, 41; 5.25). But he could and did talk about a wide range of themes--fables, painting, government, justice, elephants, flute-playing, divination, festivals, kingship, the immortality of the soul, the causes of tides and volcanoes.²

He appears throughout as primarily an adviser, ready both to rebuke and to commend anyone who met him. Spending a whole winter in Greek shrines, "he delivered many rebukes and much advice to the cities, and many of these he commended" (5.20). Reproof, if it led to reform, was quickly followed by praise. When Apollonius's reproof of Spartan effeminacy resulted in a restoration of the ancient regime, the sage displayed his pleasure by dispatching the laconic telegram:³

ἀνδρῶν μὲν τὸ μὴ ἀμαρτάνειν, γενναίων δὲ τὸ καὶ ἀμαρτάνοντας διςθεῖσθαι (4.27).

In letter 65 he reproves those Ephesians who have made the temple of Artemis a den of thieves; yet in the sixty-seventh he praises the people of Ephesus for throwing their temple open to all the world. The emperor Vespasian had consulted Apollonius on how to govern Rome (5.32-35; cf. 8.7, 11). He was later sent letters of reproof for his enslavement of Greece, but again was praised for subsequent actions which won approval (5.41).⁴

¹E.g. Letters 29-34, 77-97.

²Respectively, 5.14; 2.22; 1.37; 6.21; 2.11-15; 5.29; 2.35-37; 8.18; 5.36; 6.22; 5.2, 16-17.

³Cf. Lucian Demonax 7.

⁴Damis was rebuked for faint-heartedness in the face of Domitian (7.31). But other disciples who deserted were not reproached; instead those who remained were praised (4.36-38; cf. 5.43).

For further examples of advice cf. 4.7; for praise cf. 5.25; Letters 12, 61, 69; for reproof cf. 1.9, 13, 21; 4.2; 5.22, 23, 26; Letters 1-8, 38-41, 50-52, 54, 68.

In both words and actions Apollonius shows care and concern for mankind. In his Apology he asserts that everything he does is for mankind's salvation (*ἔγὼ γὰρ πάνθ' ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρῶτων*—8.7, X). Wherever he could he brought reconciliation to contentious faction. If during his period of silence he came across civil conflict, he would restore order by the look on his face or a gesture of the hand, and people fell silent as if at the Mysteries (1.15).

In letter 76, however, to the people of Sardis, he refuses their invitation to reconcile the city, seeing that it was already a hopeless case!

Apollonius was a helper to those in need. Instead of asking ten gifts of the Babylonian king, he pleaded the case of the Eretrians captured by Datis in the Persian Wars, and so made their crops secure against neighbouring marauders (1.35). Earlier he had restored their gravestones (1.24). In general, he worked for the good of all men. He prayed to avert an earthquake in Ionia and at Ephesus to avert the plague (4.6, 44). When people who wanted to be sure of a safe journey overloaded the boat he intended to embark, Apollonius moved with them onto a bigger one (4.13). He had regard for Damis' safety, when he told him to go by land and not sea to Dicaearchia (7.41). For similar reasons both Damis and Demetrius were advised not to be seen with him at Rome (7.15).

More particularly, Apollonius adopts the role of comforter. In prison his conversations contain both consolation and encouragement (7.22ff). Those who mourned the death of loved ones were comforted by letter.¹

Persecution

One final extraordinary quality about Apollonius is the courage with which he faces ridicule and opposition. It was, of course, almost a privilege of philosophers and religious leaders to be mocked and maltreated from time to time. But Philostratus stresses the superiority of Apollonius over other wise men and champions of freedom in the courage he displayed by standing against both Nero and Domitian. He excelled Zeno, Plato, Diogenes, Crates, and others in opposing no ordinary tyrant but the ruler of the world, at a time

¹E.g. Letters 55, 58, 93, 94. It is perhaps interesting to note the occurrence of the words *θάραξι*, *θαράσσειν* in Philostratus. Cf. 4.10, 34; 7.38; 8.23, 26.

when other philosophers had fled the country or changed their tune (7.1-3, 4, cf. 5ff).

In fact he had always had to endure opposition and rejection, not least in his home town.¹ At Ephesus he was contemptuously dismissed, when he foretold the plague; yet later he did not disdain to avert it (4.4). He never once let the accusation of sorcery upset him, and he answered the insults of his fervent antagonist, Euphrates, with philosophical refutations (5.39).²

He was undeterred by the thought of opposition at Rome (4.36). He chose to ignore the mockery of a tribune who suggested that Apollonius would be acquitted of sorcery if he could not prevent his head being cut off (2.21). While Domitian shaved his head and beard and had him chained, he remained unmoved, never ceasing to plead the innocence of Nerva and his friends (7.34). In the end both Nero and Domitian were helpless against him.

¹See Letters 44. Nevertheless, he wins honour for Tyana (letters 47, 53).

²Cf. 5.37, 6.9, and Letters 60 where Euphrates is accused of plotting Apollonius's murder.

CHAPTER VI

PHILOSTRATUS (II) SOURCES FOR THE
HISTORICAL APOLLONIUS

Absurd, inconsistent, and crammed with fabulous detail, the biography of Philostratus purported to be about a man who once did exist. Both Iamblichus and Porphyry refer to a Life of Pythagoras by one Apollonius, and Eusebius quotes at length from a treatise On Sacrifices by the same person.¹ Our problem is, however, that knowledge of Apollonius revolves almost entirely around what Philostratus tells us about him. This is further complicated by the fact that when Philostratus wrote, a full-blooded legend had grown around the figure of the historical Apollonius. Any inquiry after the real Apollonius must start with a criticism of the sources and material available to the biographer. This should be followed by a careful examination of his methods and procedure in the use made of these sources. The former will be discussed here; the latter will make up the contents of the next chapter.

Traditions other than Philostratus

Outside the one extant Life Apollonius remains a very shadowy figure indeed. But it is here that our investigation shall begin, for the general consensus of ancient opinion is not without interest in comparison with the interpretation which Philostratus would have posterity accept. At the same time, references which follow do bear witness to the existence of a man to whose life by its very extra-

¹Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 254; Porph. Vit. Pyth. 2; Eusebius Praep. Evang. 4.13.

ordinariness accrued a legend of mystery, sanctity, and magic.

Silence of contemporaries

The literary material for the latter half of the first century A.D. was never so deficient that a man of Apollonius's apparent stature ought not to receive at least a mention. Yet this is precisely what seems to have happened. Little may be expected from Seneca, who perhaps died before Apollonius's first visit to Rome under Nero. Plutarch, on the other hand, for many years a priest at Delphi and like Apollonius a revivalist and staunch believer in the ancient religion, would surely delight in such a fervent ally. Either he knows nothing of him, or what he knows he considers worthless. The silence of Josephus, who was at Alexandria with Vespasian at the time when Apollonius was alleged to have addressed the future emperor, may well be deliberate: his interest was exclusively in Jewish affairs and he may well have vied with neo-Pythagoreans at Alexandria for the favour of Vespasian.¹

Tacitus, who entered public life in the reign of Vespasian and witnessed Domitian's madness, refers nowhere to Apollonius. Admittedly the Histories end abruptly at A.D. 70 with the first Flavian firmly established on the throne. The reign of Domitian is therefore lost. But there are few gaps in the account of Nero's rule, and Apollonius figures nowhere in miracles which attended Vespasian at Alexandria.²

The nearest we come to a contemporary notice is in a discourse of Dio Chrysostom, according to Philostratus a friend of Apollonius. Speaking to the people of Celaenae in Phrygia (Or. 35.3-4) Dio disparages what he calls long-haired dogmatists who wear but a single cloth, and included in his list "men who have won admiration merely by reason of their silence". His audience may well have understood this as an allusion to one who had recently emerged from Tyana in the neighbouring province of Cappadocia. If so, of course, it does seem rather uncomplimentary from a man who in Philostratus appears as an avowed admirer of Apollonius!

¹ Josephus also predicted that Vespasian would become emperor and was thus promptly released from prison (Joseph. BJ. 3.8, 8 (392-408); cf. Suet. Vesp. 5; Dio Cass. 66.1).

² Suetonius makes no mention of Apollonius in the Lives of the Caesars.

The legend before Philostratus

The earliest certain reference to Apollonius¹ is made by Lucian, who died sometime after A.D. 180.² He may have known Philostratus but seems not to have lived to read the latter's biography. Lucian claims as teacher of Alexander the false prophet "a certain Tyanean of the kind which associated with Apollonius and was acquainted with the whole of his life" (Alex. 5). In this last phrase it appears that Lucian believes Apollonius to be something of a showman.³

Artemidorus, the Antonine writer on dreams, almost certainly alludes to the legend told about Apollonius's birth, namely that his mother dreamt that Proteus was to be the father (1.4f). "To dream of Proteus," he says, "or Glaucus, or Phorcys, or their attendant demons signifies fraud and deceit, on account of the versatility of the gods seen in the dream. But for prophets (to dream of these) is good."⁴

The history of Dio Cassius contains two very important items on Apollonius. The vagueness and anonymity with which he is introduced would lead us also to infer that to Dio at least the sage was relatively unknown. At all events, this section of the Roman History was probably written before Philostratus had published.⁵

In the first abstract Dio mentions "a certain Apollonius of Tyana" who on the very same day and at the same hour--as was later verified--saw "in Ephesus or elsewhere" the assassination of Domitian. Both the circumstances of the incident and the words said to have been uttered

¹Apuleius (Apologia 90) lists the famous magi of antiquity. What was once thought to be Apollonius's name in the list is now considered to be that of Apollobex, whom Pliny cites in a section of the Natural History on the origin of magic (HN 30.2, 9). See E. Meyer, "Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratus" Hermes 52 (1917), op. cit., p. 385.

²Lucian Alex. 48.

³The pupil of Alexander is called a *γόης τῶν μαγείας καὶ ἐπωδῶς θεοτελείου ὑπισχυμένων... καὶ θησαυρῶν ἀναπομπῆς* (Alex. 5). This was undoubtedly the view which Lucian took of Apollonius. Cf. VA 6.39.

⁴Artem. Oneirocrit. 2.38.

⁵Since Philostratus almost certainly did not publish before A.D. 217 (see below, p.140) and Dio wrote during the years A.D. 201-22, this would seem quite reasonable. See further E. Cary in the Loeb translation of Dio Cassius, vol. 1, p. xi.

differ from Philostratus's account.¹ But in all probability they were using a similar local source. For Dio the opportunity to learn the tradition about Apollonius may have arisen when his own father was governor of Cilicia.² The second abstract from Dio attests the admiration of Caracalla for Apollonius. So great was the emperor's delight in wizards and sorcerers, says Dio, that he paid respect to "Apollonius the Cappadocian" who flourished in Domitian's reign and was a complete wizard and sorcerer (γότης καὶ μάγος ἀκριβής), and he built for him a shrine.³ Cappadocian was a proverbial term of reproach and there can be no doubt that in Dio's mind Apollonius was a γότης of the lowest order. The shrine of Caracalla, however, is evidence of the renown of Apollonius, and it was built at Tyana before Philostratus had completed his work.

Much of the foregoing evidence would appear to be unfavourable. Philostratus, as we shall see, set out to whitewash Apollonius. A probable source for the early tradition may readily be conjectured.

Tzetzes, who writing in the twelfth century A.D. quotes much that is not contained in Philostratus, names his sources in the following manner:⁴

Γράφουσι ταῦτα... Φιλόστρατος καὶ Μάξιμος
ὁμοῦ καὶ Μοιραγένης,
καὶ πλήθος ἄλλο πάμπλειστον, οὔσπερ οὐ σθένω λέγειν.

Now it is possible that by the collective reference at the end he is referring simply to the many authors who borrowed from Philostratus and to translations of his work which may have survived.⁵ With Moeragenes,

¹Dio Cass. 67.18. In Dio the assassin is named by Apollonius, who is not in the middle of a speech (cf. VA 8.26) but ascends a stone pulpit and gathers together a crowd. See also above, p.110.

²See Dio Cass. 72.7, 2; cf. 69.1, 3; 49.36, 4.

³Dio Cass. 78.18. For the shrine cf. VA 8.31.

⁴Tzetzes Chiliades 2.973-35.

⁵We know, for example, that the miracle of Apollonius's disappearance from Domitian's court and his vision of the assassination are recorded also in Lactantius, Ps. - Ambrose, and Jerome. See J. S. Phillimore, Philostratus in Honour of Apollonius of Tyana (Oxford, 1912), p. xcvi. For translations of Philostratus see below, p.133.

however, we are on much firmer ground. This is the one work which Philostratus openly chooses to ignore. The four books in question are dismissed with a single sentence the more suspicious for its peremptoriness and brevity.

οὐ γὰρ Μοιραγένης γε προσεκτέον, ... πολλὰ δὲ τῶν
περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ἀγνοήσαντι (VA 1.3).

This is undisguised polemic, a clear warning that much of what follows will be new to readers who are acquainted only with Moeragenes. Conversely, we should expect that much of the ancient tradition which so evidently contradicts Philostratus is likely to have appeared in the work of Moeragenes, who could have written any time between Apollonius's death and the publication of Philostratus's work.

Both to the existence of these books and to the probable nature of their content we have also the comparatively early testimony of Origen (c. A.D. 240). Evidently Celsus had attributed importance to the remark of Dionysus the Milesian that magicians could work their powers only on the uneducated and the deranged, not on philosophers by reason of the wholesomeness of their lives. Whoever wants to know, says Origen, whether or not philosophers can be overpowered by magic should read "the Memorabilia written by Moeragenes of Apollonius the magus and philosopher of Tyana", in which he says that some quite distinguished philosophers, including Euphrates and an Epicurean, approached Apollonius as if he were a γόης and were transformed by the μαγεία which he possessed.¹ In the tradition preserved by Moeragenes, then, Apollonius was a sorcerer who practised magic. Yet this is precisely what Philostratus emphatically denies, and his work is partly an apologetic directed against that popular view.²

The defence of the charge of wizardry will form a section by itself in the next chapter and must not delay us here.³ However, it is important to notice that in speaking of the charge Philostratus is no doubt thinking of Moeragenes--naturally he will not mention

¹Origen c. Celsum 6.41. It is impossible to say with certainty if this is the same Moeragenes who in Plutarch (Quaest. Conv. 4.6 - fragmentary) affirmed that the God of the Jews was Dionysus. See E. Meyer "Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratus" Hermes 52 (1917), op. cit., p. 387.

²See below, p. 181.

³See below, pp. 181ff.

him by name--or at least the tradition he represents. This must have been strong and it obviously caused him considerable distress. He could not always refute incidents; it remained only to reinterpret them.¹ Thus we may unknowingly be looking at material from Moeragenes in the pages of Philostratus!

One further point may be made. If Moeragenes filled four books, there must have been no shortage of material. Moreover, Philostratus was so painstaking a researcher that he may hardly be expected completely to disregard a source, however firmly he professes to do so. I dare say he was pleased to use a great deal of what he found in Moeragenes so long as it conformed, or rather was made to conform, to his own interpretation of Apollonius. All this seems reasonable enough. It is hoped later to point to indications of it in the text. But to say more would be rash.

Reputation after Philostratus

We may be confident that after Philostratus the Apollonius-legend was more or less complete. Any further development continued rather than extended the traditions.² This would mean that the picture of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* went back to Philostratus and his sources, that of *μάγος καὶ γόης* to Moeragenes and his sources. In either case Apollonius may have been grossly misunderstood, the character of his life being by nature so remarkable that, wherever he went, his actions were interpreted divinely or diabolically, according to inclination and circumstance. At all events, after Philostratus the world was provided with two different views of Apollonius, one highly uncomplimentary, the other quite the reverse.

The uncomplimentary view seems to have been the earlier one set down in writing, if it was not also the popular tradition. It was held certainly by Lucian and Dio Cassius, probably by Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch.³ If Philostratus's view did not precede this, it soon

¹See, for example, 4.25; 5.12. The reference to vengery (1.13) and to a false account of the trial (7.35) are, perhaps, the least improbable allusions to Moeragenes.

²Thus the vision of Aurelian (Vopiscus Script. Hist. Aug. Aurelian 24) is consistent with the Philostratean Apollonius, whereas the talismans of later writers are consistent with the *γόης* of Moeragenes and Lucian. See below, pp. 135f.

³See above, pp. 128f.

surpassed, though never entirely replaced, it.

After Philostratus evidence of these two divergent views is more forthcoming. To take favourable opinion first, if in the lifetime of Apollonius Nero and Domitian were hostile, at least three emperors paid him respect when he had ceased to live. The shrine erected at Tyana in A.D. 215 has already received mention.¹ It was attested both by Dio Cassius and by Philostratus, who would have been compiling his material at the very time when Caracalla was marching through Cappadocia. Possibly no more than a decade after the publication of the Life the emperor Severus Alexander (A.D. 222-235) placed a statue of Apollonius along with one of Abraham, Orpheus and Christ in a personal lararium.² Aurelian (emperor A.D. 270-275), as he was besieging Tyana, had a vision of the sage, who pleaded for his home town to be spared. The emperor consented and promised Apollonius a portrait, statues, and a temple.³

Vopiscus, author of the Augustan History who vouches for the last incident in the preceding paragraph, promises himself one day to write a book on the wonderful life of Apollonius. We hear no more of this, but an Egyptian epic poet Soterichus (c. A.D. 300) was author of a work on Apollonius.⁴ It may have been no more than a version of Philostratus's book. At all events, Sidonius Apollinaris (c. A.D. 430-479) sent to his friend Leon a copy of Philostratus translated by Nicomachus--possibly the fourth century champion of the old paganism--and revised by Tascius Victorianus.⁵

It is not surprising that sophists of the same period find much to praise in the redeemed Apollonius. Ammianus Marcellinus (c. A.D. 330-395) in his History refers to Cappadocia as the birth-place of amplissimus ille philosophus Apollonius. The sage is praised for relying on the

¹See above, p.130.

²Lampridius S.H.A. Alexander 29

³Vopiscus S.H.A. Aurelian 24. He quotes as his authority trustworthy (gravis) men and books read over and again in the Ulpian Library. The story may be perfectly true. Aurelian could have made use of military credulity in order to retract a command that he later regretted.

⁴Suidas s.v.

⁵Sidonius Apollinaris Epist. 8.3. For Nicomachus see H. Bloch, Conflict between Paganism and Christianity (ed. A. Momigliano, 1963), ch. 8.

support of his guardian spirit and in this respect is classed with Pythagoras, Socrates, Numa Pompilius, the elder Scipio, Hermes Termaximus, and Plotinus.¹ Eunapius (c. A.D. 345-420) affirms that far more than a philosopher Apollonius was *τε θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπου μέσον*, and that Philostratus ought to have called his book *Ἐπιδημίαν ἐς ἀνθρώπους θεοῦ*.² In a different passage he lists among the disciples of Pythagoras *καὶ οἱ προσκυνήσαντες Ἀπολλώνιον, οἵτινες σῶμα τε ἔδοξαν ἔχειν καὶ εἶναι ἄνθρωποι*.³

From the close of the third century A.D. Apollonius figures prominently in the views of Christian apologists. The great conflict between paganism and Christianity was now coming to a head. Sometime during the reign of Diocletian (A.D. 286-305) a certain Hierocles, governor of Bithynia, composed an anti-Christian pamphlet, probably timed to coincide with the emperor's persecution, in which Apollonius was favourably compared with Christ as, if anything, the greater sage and miracle-worker.⁴ Its effect was to bring Apollonius into as great disrepute with Christian writers as Philostratus earlier had won him honour and praise in the Greek and Roman world. The unfavourable tradition earlier represented by Moeragenes was now to undergo a resuscitation on a scale commensurable to that of Philostratus's version.

Arnobius, writing after his conversion to Christianity (c. A.D. 295), classes Apollonius along with Zoroaster and others as magi and therefore incomparable to Christ.⁵ His pupil Lactantius (c. A.D. 240-c. 320) answered the questions raised by Hierocles, of which the parallel of Christ and Apollonius was only one. He observes that Apollonius was worshipped by some as a god and that a statue of him under the name of Hercules Alexicacos was set up at Ephesus and even to that day held in

¹ Amm. Marc. 23.6, 19 and 21.14, 3.

² Eunapius VS Proemium 6 (p. 454).

³ Ibid. p. 500 (Vita Chrysanthi). Cf. the famous fragment from Aristotle On the Pythagoreans *τοῦ λογικοῦ βίου τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ θεός, τὸ δὲ ἄνθρωπος, τὸ δὲ οἶον Πυθαγόρας* (fr. 192). See below, p. 197.

⁴ For Hierocles see CIL III.133 = III 1661; Lactant. Div. Inst. 5.4, 2; 5.2, 12. See also P. de Labriolle, La Réaction Paienne (Paris 1948), pp. 303ff. For the controversy see below, pp. 197ff.

⁵ Arnobius Adv. Nat. 1.52.

honour. His point, however, was that Christians believed not because of wonders but because all that Christ did was foretold in the prophets.¹ On the other hand, John Chrysostom (c. A.D. 354-407) did not mince matters. He called Apollonius a deceiver and evil-doer and branded the account of his life as fiction.²

Clear indication of two contrary traditions may be found in a letter of Isidorus of Pelusium (died A.D. 450). He is content to recommend Philostratus on the ground that he had removed from Apollonius the imputation of sorcery. He denied truth in rumours that Apollonius had set up τελέσματα in various parts of the world in order to protect the inhabitants.³ But the evidence for talismans of Apollonius is most impressive, and although most of it is late in origin, it is possible that it caused not inconsiderable difficulties for Philostratus.⁴ Photius (c. A.D. 820-891), who believed the Life to be a string of lies, admits that Philostratus denied Apollonius to be a "wonder-worker" (τελεστής), although "wonders" (τελέσματα) were commonly attributed to him by others.⁵ Evidently there was a distinction to be made between the respectable wonders which are related by Philostratus and the dabbling in magic charms and incantations which popular tradition claims for Apollonius.

Pseudo-Justin Martyr (fourth or fifth century A.D.)⁶ preserves a very clear picture of the nature of these talismans. "If God," he says, "is Creator and Lord of the world, how do talismans of Apollonius have power in parts of the world? For as we see they retard the violence of the sea and the force of the winds and the sudden attacks of vermin and wild animals."⁷ These well-known (ὡς ὁρῶμεν) consecrated objects are not denied. They are attributed to an understanding of the forces

¹Lactantius Div. Inst. 5.3. E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 397, believes this to be a distortion of VA 4.10. Could it not be Philostratus who misrepresented the facts?

²John Chrysostom Adv. Judaeos 5.3 (p. 631b); cf. Homilies 4 (p. 493d).

³Isidorus of Pelusium Epist. 1.398 (PG 78. 405b).

⁴See below, p. 184.

⁵Photius Bibl. cod. 44 and 241.

⁶This work, certainly spurious, is variously dated with little possibility of accuracy. See P. de Labriolle, op. cit., p. 456.

⁷Ps.-Justin Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos Q. 24.

of nature and allowed by God to stand as a service to mankind. Nevertheless, a demon which had occupied a statue of Apollonius and had tricked people into worshipping him as a god was silenced once and for all.¹

These talismans are corroborated by evidence of the sixth century A.D. Malalas (c. A.D. 491-578) affirms that under Domitian flourished one Apollonius of Tyana who travelled to various cities and places *καὶ πανταχοῦ ποιῶν τελέσματα*. More specifically, at Constantinople in addition to other wonders he made a talisman against storks, a talisman of the river Lykos, which flows through that city, one of a tortoise and another of a horse. In Malalas' own city of Antioch talismans were recorded against gnats, scorpions, and the north wind.² Cedrenus, writing in the eleventh century but citing the sixth century patriarch Anastasius of Antioch (A.D. 539-599), refers to *ἀποτελέσματα* of Apollonius set up in certain places which even at that time were active. Some dealt with animals and birds, others with the flood of a river, and others removed sundry disasters affecting mankind.³

This feature in the tradition is preserved also in analecta of very late origin.⁴ Tzetzes, for example, related the circumstances under which at Byzantium a talisman was consecrated by Apollonius against storks.⁵ It is clear from two further citations that the talismans were statues over which a spell had been pronounced. Codinus,

¹ Ibid. Q. 16.

² Malalas Chronographia p. 263, 18 - p. 266, 11 (= Chron. Pasch. 467). For a detailed picture of the *τελέσματα* of Apollonius see R. M. Dawkins, "Ancient Statues in Mediaeval Constantinople, Folklore 35 No. 3 (1924), p. 209ff. Cf. E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 390f.

³ Cedrinus Compendium Historiarum p. 432. He calls Apollonius *φιλόσοφος Πυθαγόρειος στοιχειωματικός* (=astrologer).

⁴ A late astrological work is attributed to Apollonius *βίβλος σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως ἀποτελεσμάτων Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Τυανέως* = Boll in Catalogus codd. astrol. graec. VII, codd. german. p. 174ff., as cited by E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 389 n.2, quoting E. Norden, Agnostos Theos (Leipzig, 1923), p. 37 n.3. For this work see also J. Bidez and F. Cumont, Les Mages hellénisés (2 vols. Paris, 1938), II p. 241, where the reference is to Catal. codd. astrol. V. 1, p. 98f and VIII.2, p. 149ff.

⁵ Tzetzes Chiliades 2.925ff.

an eleventh century compilation, has the following entry: "a bronze gnat and a fly and other small insects stood on the western apse of the forum of Taurus (in Constantinople). They were consecrated by Apollonius of Tyana, and as long as they were standing neither flies, nor fleas, nor gnats were to be found in the city. But the emperor Basil ignorantly had them destroyed."¹

Two centuries later Nicetas records that "there stood in the Hippodrome a bronze eagle, a contrivance invented by Apollonius of Tyana and a magnificent example of his magical powers. For when he came once to Byzantium, the people asked him to charm away the snakes which by their bites were causing grievous pain. By the aid of secret arts known to devils and all who take part in their rites he set up an eagle on a column (with a snake in its talons)."² Finally, certain bronze doors containing prophecies--perhaps the *Χρησμοί*, one of his lost works--were enchanted by Apollonius and, according to Nicetas, as late as the thirteenth century had to be destroyed because of the evil influence they had even on Christians.³

I have gone into detail here because I believe it is important that a tradition so contrary to Philostratus's portrait should be noticed. One point is now established beyond doubt: although

Philostratus almost totally redeemed the reputation of Apollonius, the popular tradition of the sorcerer, which many preferred to believe, could not completely be suppressed.

But there were, even among Christian writers, some who took an almost favourable view of Apollonius. This must surely redound to the credit of Philostratus, who gave the world a portrait not simply of a thaumaturge but of a philosopher as well. Testimonies of Isidorus Pelusinus and Pseudo-Justin have been noticed earlier.⁴ Even Eusebius (c. A.D. 260-340) was prepared to call him a wise man

¹Codinus De Signis Const. Pol. 124.5. It is not clear whether Basil I (d. A.D. 886) or Basil II (c. A.D. 958-1025) is meant.

²Nicetas Choniates 861.16.

³Codinus op. cit., 54.9 - 55.6. For Nicetas see G. R. S. Mead, Apollonius of Tyana the Philosopher-Reformer of the First Century A.D. (London, 1901), p. 41, quoting from P. J. B. Legrand d'Aussy, Vie d'Apollonius de Tyane (2 vols. Paris, 1807) p. 308. Further parallels are given by R. M. Dawkins, op. cit. pp. 242ff. Cf. J. Miller, Philologus 51 (1892) pp. 581-84; O. Weinreich, Antike Heilungswunder (Giessen, 1909),

⁴See above, p. 135.

pp. 162ff.

as far as human terms may go.¹ Jerome (c. A.D. 347-420) declared that after reading Philostratus he found everywhere things by learning which he would become a better man: sive ille magus, ut vulgus loquitur, sive philosophus ut Pythagorici tradunt.² Augustine (A.D. 354-430) ridiculed the attempt at comparison between Apollonius and Christ, but thought the character of the sage to be far superior to that of Jupiter in respect of virtus.³

Non-literary evidence

Inscriptional evidence, however small, deserves a place in the discussion. A coin of Hadrian's reign bears the legend Τύαννα ἱέρὰ, ἄσυλος, αὐτονόμος.⁴ Hadrian's interest in Apollonius is attested by Philostratus;⁵ presumably some time after the sage's death his home town was accounted a sacred city and entitled to elect its own magistrates.⁶

A medallion on the wall of a room in a Roman house is inscribed [Ap]ollonius Thyaneus.⁷ A contorniate which displays the sage's image has the legend Apollonius Teanius. On the reverse is a victorious charioteer and the words Eliane nica.⁸ Both would seem to be some sort of lucky mascot.

¹Eusebius c. Hieroclem 5.

²Jerome Ep. ad Pallinum 53. Here magus and philosophus are in contradistinction.

³Augustine Ep. 138, cf. 102, and 32. Cassiodorus (fifth century) spoke of the "renowned philosopher", and Syncellus (eighth century) called Apollonius the first and most remarkable of all famous people who appeared under the Roman Empire. See G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p. 40, quoting from Legrand d'Aussy, op. cit., p. 313.

⁴Olearius on Philostr. VA 8.31. See Cardinal Newman in Encyclopaedia Metropolitana (London, 1845), X.p. 622.

⁵Cf. VA 8.20 and the collection of Apollonius's letters said to have been kept in Hadrian's villa at Antium.

⁶One would expect this honour to be bestowed later, say, after the consecration of Caracalla's temple. For "sacred cities" see Hdt. 1.80: 2.41; Plato Phaedo 85b; Polybius 4.18.10.

⁷Dessau ILS 2918 = CIL VI. 29828.

⁸Cohen Méd. impér. VIII. p. 281. See also E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 286 n.2. For the complete reference see the Bibliography.

Sources of Philostratus

The principal source for Apollonius was an educated Greek sophist who came from a family of sophists bearing the same name. His identity in spite of inaccuracies in the Suda has long been determined.¹ Any attempt, however, to date the Life of Apollonius can only be approximate. It was certainly among his earlier writings, for Philostratus refers back to it in the Lives of the Sophists, the work of his maturity (p. 570 Kayser). He would, then, be only a young man while he belonged to the literary and cultural "circle" of the empress Julia Domna.²

As Philostratus tells us, it was the empress herself who, as it were, commissioned the biography. A certain Assyrian, a descendant of the sage's closest companion, brought to court memoirs which hitherto had been kept in his family.³ Philostratus was immediately set to work on them and by his own further research to compile an account of the life of this most extraordinary man. The task was far from displeasing to the sophist; he tells us he spared no pains in seeking information (8.31; cf. 1.3), and everywhere displays the talent of an ardent antiquarian.

Some have plausibly imagined that the scene at Achilles' tomb (4.11-16) was written up in A.D. 215-16 as a compliment to Caracalla, who in that winter had performed elaborate ceremonies at the tomb and erected a statue in the hero's honour.⁴ Now it was on this expedition

¹The most recent author to tackle this "notorious snare" is G. W. Bowersock, Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire (Oxford, 1969), pp. 2ff. Fuller treatment is given by F. Solmsen in Real-Encyclopädie XX (1941) pp. 125ff. For the earliest critical analysis see K. Munscher, "Die Philostrate", Philologus Suppl. X (1905/07), pp. 469ff.

²For the circle see Dio Cass. 75.15, 6-7; cf. 77.18, 3. Whatever its nature, it is dangerous to underestimate the prestige of such a group. Certainly, when Caracalla was on the throne, the renewed political activities of his mother will to some extent have diminished the formerly exclusive interest in literature and philosophy. See G. W. Bowersock, op. cit., pp. 101ff. and cf. his views in the Introduction to the Penguin translation (by C. P. Jones, 1970), p. 10.

Philostratus states in VS p. 623 that he was twenty-four years old in the reign of Caracalla. This would put the date of his birth somewhere between A.D. 187 and 193.

³VA 1.3.

⁴Dio Cass. 77.16; cf. Herodian 8.4.

that the young emperor was accompanied by his mother, Julia Domna, and, presumably, her entourage.¹ Since the Life contains no dedication to the person who in the first place had authorized it, Philostratus almost certainly published it after Julia's death (spring or summer A.D. 217)² F. Solmsen has argued convincingly for a publication before the Heroicus (i.e. before A.D. 219) on the grounds that the Life contains in germinal form ideas which are developed at greater length in the later work.³

Effort and concentration on Philostratus's part may safely be assumed. But what about his aptitude for the task? Writing some hundred years after Apollonius's death, can he be expected to give a historically accurate and sensitive account of his life? Can a sophist who nowhere lays claim to the name of philosopher, not to mention Pythagorean, write with more than superficial understanding about a leading figure in the revival of religious Pythagorism in the first century A.D.? This question needs to be answered in two parts. First, we must investigate the sources available and reach a conclusion on the possibility of historical accuracy. Then we must look closely at Philostratus's methods and motivation, and ask ourselves if his interpretation is governed by something more than a simple desire for historical truth.

The sources of material are in fact listed early in the first book (1.2f.). They were the writings of Apollonius, his early life as written by Maximus of Aegae, various local and verbal traditions, and the memoirs of Damis. These will now be considered one by one.

Apollonius's own writings

Suidas gives as writings of Apollonius *Τελετὰς ἢ περὶ Θεσιῶν, Διαθήκην, Χρησμούς, Ἐπιστολάς, Πυθαγόρου βίον.*⁴ All are mentioned

¹Dio Cass. 78.4, 3. Julia was resident at Antioch in A.D. 215.

²Philostratus (VA 1.3) speaks of Julia as if he were no longer a member of her circle. Her commission is considered simply as a formal contract.

³F. Solmsen, "Some Works of Philostratus the Elder", TAPA 71 (1940), pp. 556ff.

⁴Suidas s.v. Ἀπολλώνιος. Cf. VA 1.2-3; 3.41; 7.35; 8.20.

in one place or another by Philostratus, who adds of his own authority an Ἀπολογία which he declares the sage was ready to deliver had the opportunity arisen.¹

The Will (διαθήκη), if that is what it was, receives only a mention. It was written in the Ionic dialect, and from it Philostratus, who evidently had seen it, observes that one could learn how divinely inspired Apollonius's philosophy was.²

Apollonius's Life of Pythagoras is used as a source by Porphyry (Vit. Pyth. 2) and Iamblichus (Vit. Pyth. 254). Philostratus, however, does not refer to it by name. There is only one veiled reference to it as a book containing the tenets of Pythagoras with which Apollonius had emerged from the cave of Trophonius in Lebadea, and which was at that time kept in Hadrian's palace at Antium. One could infer that Philostratus did not wish to draw his readers' attention to the Life of Pythagoras--it may have been largely unknown--since it was to form the pattern for his own work. But we must be careful not to take this too far. The whole question of the Pythagorean legend is hopelessly complicated, and it has been maintained earlier that comparison between the Life of Apollonius and various Lives of Pythagoras is essentially one of atmosphere and tone, not of specific details.³ Further discussion here is inappropriate. Neither the nature nor the length of the lost work can be determined with any precision; its influence on Philostratus will, therefore, remain unknown. We can be confident only of Philostratus's knowledge of its existence.

Considerable emphasis is placed both in the Life and in the Letters of Apollonius on religious ritual. It should cause little surprise, therefore, to find notice of a book by him On Sacrifices. The title that appears in Suidas (τελευταὶ ἡ περὶ θυσιῶν) suggests that it was a fairly comprehensive document on religious ceremony. Its nature may be seen in part from an extract fortunately preserved in Eusebius.⁴

¹ VA 8, 6 and 7.

² This must have contained a summary of Apollonius's teachings. διαθήκη may mean "manifesto" here, i.e. a statement of past and future policy.

³ See above, ch. II pp.27, 43.

⁴ Eusebius Praep. Evang. 4.13. See also E. Norden, op. cit., pp. 343ff., where he compares Porphyry De Abst. 2.34 as a possible paraphrase of Apollonius's actual words.

It is important to observe that it verifies Philostratus's portrait, not the one we have attributed to Moeragenes. In it the offering of sacrifices is deprecated: men are to worship the highest of beings only with their highest faculty, the mind. Philostratus tells us that he found this treatise in several temples, cities, and in the homes of many learned men, and that it was written in the Cappadocian tongue.¹ Again he was familiar with its contents, but it seems to have been either beyond his comprehension or outside his interests, for he gives few details of Apollonius's teachings on this subject, contenting himself so often with the bare statement that the sage taught and reformed τὰ ἱερά.

The Oracles (Χρησμοί) of the Suda probably refer to what Philostratus calls four books On Divination by the Stars (περὶ μαντείας ἀστέρων 3.41). It apparently embodied the results of a discussion between Apollonius and the Indian sage Iarchus, and was mentioned by Moeragenes. But Philostratus virtually denies the authenticity of this work in a manner which is at first sight strange. For he declares that this branch of divination (by the stars) is "totally beyond human capacity". Yet at other times he seeks to explain Apollonius's powers of divination by reference to his super-human nature.² Clearly Moeragenes had mentioned the work in order to damage the sage's reputation--astrology was always a suspicious occupation in the Roman world.³ Philostratus, who may not have been able to deny the existence of such a work, could only doubt if Apollonius was the author.

Far more important as a source are the Letters of Apollonius. For our purposes two separate groups must be distinguished. On the one hand, there were those letters which have survived only in the work of Philostratus, whether quoted in full or referred to in passing. On the other hand, there were the letters which survived as a collection

¹VA 3.41 and 4.19.

²Cf. 4.44; 5.7; 8.7,x; 8.27.

³

At least nine times between the years 139 B.C. and A.D. 93 astrologers were banished from Rome. See the article on "Astrology and the Roman Government" by H. H. Scullard in The Oxford Classical Dictionary (2nd edition Oxford, 1970), p. 134.

in complete isolation from Philostratus's narrative. A collection of letters, by no means complete (*οὐ γὰρ διή πάδας*—8.20), was kept by Hadrian in his palace at Antium. These we should expect to be genuine since they were in existence long before Philostratus wrote and before any serious growth could have occurred in the legend. The extant collection, however, certainly contains forgeries, and so if both are connected, the latter is at the most an expanded edition of the former.¹

Letters cited by Philostratus are of three sorts. First, there are those which are also found in the separate extant collection.² Secondly, there are allusions to letters which are not in the extant collection.³ Thirdly, non-extant letters are quoted partially or in full.⁴ A further distinction needs to be made. Letters are sometimes cited in order to substantiate statements of either Philostratus or Damis; at other times they simply form part of the narrative in the course of which Apollonius happened to write to a certain person.⁵ Again, of the letters which do not appear in the extant collection there are at least three sources of origin. They could have been found in the collection which Hadrian possessed; they may have been cited by Damis; and one or two of them are, perhaps, best understood as the work of Philostratus himself, serving only as a stylistic arrangement of details.⁶

When with a view to corroborating his various statements Philostratus alludes to letters which have not survived in our collection, we should

¹In 1.2 the list of addressees includes the Egyptians (cf. 3.15), but no such letters are to be found in the extant collection.

²E.g. 1.23 (Letters 19); 4.5 (Letters 71), 26 (Letters 36, 37, cf. 60), 27 (Letters 63, 64); 5.39 (Letters 1-8, 14-18, 50-52, 60, 79-80), 40 (Letters 9, 10, cf. 90); 6.13 (as for 5.39). Also with 4.31 cf. Letters 62.

³1.2, 7, 32; 5.2; 6.27; 7.8, 31, 42.

⁴1.24; 3.51; 4.22, 27, 46; 5.41; 6.29, 33; 8.7, iii; 8.27.

⁵Letters cited in the previous note substantiate what Philostratus says. Letters which simply form part of the narrative occur in 5.10; 6.18, 31; 8.28.

⁶Of such a kind is the letter to the governor of Baetica (5.10) and the letter given to Damis for delivery to Nerva (8.28).

not doubt their reality as genuine documents. For if Philostratus needed to invent references, would it not better serve his purpose if he inserted actual quotations and foisted these upon Apollonius? If anything, he will be alluding to fabrications of other people than himself forging references which did not exist. At all events, his readers could probably check these references by having recourse to letters in circulation at that time.

Letters not in the extant collection which he does quote in the text may not have received wide promulgation; hence the need to quote from rather than allude to them. Some of these, of course, may be part of the stylistic arrangement of the narrative, that is genuine sentiments falsely placed in an epistolary mould.¹ However, certain letters in this group are manifestly not the inventions of Philostratus. The selection of letters written to and from Musonius, if not genuine, belong rather to an admirer of Musonius than of Apollonius; for upon closer examination it is the former who is set in the nobler light. In the first one (4.46) Apollonius offers to be of service to Musonius in prison without leaving it in doubt that he means to set him free. The latter is grateful but declines the offer and trusts rather in his own defence at court than in whatever (magical?) means Apollonius may have contrived for his escape.² In his eagerness to incorporate this genuine material Philostratus had overlooked its true propensity. Similarly the three letters to Vespasian tell of a conflict between the emperor and Apollonius (5.41), whereas a pronounced theme in the Life is their friendship and the influence of the sage upon the ruler. Why should Philostratus include in his account letters in which Vespasian was severely reprimanded for depriving Greece of the liberation earlier granted by Nero, if he were not so entirely convinced of their authenticity? Here also he has made a concession to the tradition. But immediately after quoting them he returns to his former statement of the two men's relationship and says that when Apollonius later heard of the excellence of the emperor's subsequent reign he made no attempt to hide his delight, considering the whole thing as a favour done to himself.

¹E. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 405ff., believed that most of the letters were from Philostratus's pen. This is unwarrantable as F. Solmsen has shown in Real-Encyclopädie XX p. 148.

²Cf. F. Solmsen, op. cit., p. 149.; J. Hempel, Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung von Apollonius von Tyana (Stockholm, 1920), p. 14; J. Jessen, Apollonius von Tyana und sein Biograph Philostratus (Hamburg, 1885), p. 20.

The collection of letters which has survived is independent of Philostratus's account. If the letters which it contains are typical of collections known to Philostratus, we may naturally expect him to have treated these like any other source. There would be much he could use and refer to, but there would also be much he would wish to ignore. So heterogeneous a miscellany is our collection that it is impossible to assign it to any one period either before or after Philostratus. But we may assume that a central core of it was pre-Philostratean, as the existence of letters of Apollonius in the ancient world is openly admitted. It would, therefore, be natural to suppose that information contained in the greater part of the collection preceded and was possibly a source for Philostratus. It will, then, serve a three-fold purpose: to confirm what is already known; to supply additional information; and sometimes to provide a contrast to the narrative of Philostratus.¹

Finally among the writings of Apollonius is adduced an Apology (8.6f.) which the sage had prepared for his defence but was unable to deliver because Domitian confined him to four straightforward questions (8.5). It is introduced somewhat awkwardly by Philostratus, and many have believed it to be his own free composition.² In the preface Philostratus defends the rough and unpolished style of the speech. A wise man, he says, will display neither cleverness nor condescension. The last sentence, however, does look suspicious: "This is how the speech will seem to those who listen carefully to me and to Apollonius" (8.6). It could reasonably be claimed that here, in accordance with the accepted practice of ancient writers, Philostratus was giving his own version of what seemed appropriate to the occasion, naturally keeping very closely to the essence of what was actually said.³ To label such passages as

¹For a more detailed analysis of these letters, the question of authenticity, and the light they shed on Philostratus see Appendix 1.

²E. Rohde, Rheinisches Museum 27 p. 55, believed it to be clumsy and out of place. C. G. Cobet, Mnemosyne 8 pp. 150ff., thought it genuine. J. Jessen, op. cit., p. 28, believed that if any original version had existed, it must have been thoroughly worked up by Philostratus. E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 419, regarded the work as completely fictitious. R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen (Leipzig, 1906) p. 47, referred to VA 7.35, where perversions of the account of the trial were mentioned, and stated that this favoured the idea of a genuine original which Philostratus altered and revised.

³Thuc. 1.22.

"pure invention"¹ is to misunderstand and, probably, to underestimate this time-honoured tradition.

Nevertheless, credit for a great part of the speech must belong to Philostratus. Apollonius was no sophist, as is openly admitted (1.17). Traces of artistry and rhetoric are undoubtedly alien to his style. Several instances of this may be noticed. The reference to Socrates (8.7, (i)) suggests the obvious comparison with Plato's Apology, prototype for any such composition. The insertion of an entire letter from Vespasian to Apollonius is a highly sophisticated device (8.7, iii). The superb oratory of the answer to the charge of performing a human sacrifice (8.7, xii) so disturbed Philostratus that he made Apollonius apologize for it!²

Not all of the speech deals with the formal indictment. Both before and after that is answered Apollonius deals with insinuations of corruption (8.7, ii), sorcery (8.7, iii), and treason (8.7, xvi). In particular the highly rhetorical defence of the discourse on Destiny spoken earlier at Ephesus (7.8-9), which Euphrates alleged to be against Domitian's interests, looks very much like a sophistic show-piece (ἐπίδειξις cf. 8.7, xvi). At the same time, these sections are not inconsonant with the apologetic character of the work as a whole, and one is tempted to treat them as part of an expansion by Philostratus of his original source. The Homeric quotation which he says he found at the end of the speech (8.8 = Iliad 22, 13) will there be in its correct context, and the earlier citation of it just before Apollonius "vanished" from the court (8.5) will be part of Philostratus's attempt to amalgamate two separate accounts into one. In the first there will have been no speech, but only a trial and a straightforward interrogation conducted by the emperor, in the other an official indictment together with a formal reply will have been stated in full.

¹G. W. Bowersock in the Introduction to the Penguin translation by C. P. Jones (1970), p. 16.

²ρητορικώτερον ἕως ἀπολογία τοῦμοῦ τρόπου κτλ. For similar passages of rhetoric cf. 8.7, xiv on the alibi for the accusation of performing a human sacrifice; 8.7, xv for a list of famous sooth-sayers—a favourite device of the sophist (cf. 2.5; 7.2-3); 8.7, xvi for literary quotations from Homer and Sophocles, and cf. literary allusions elsewhere in the speech.

That there was a version of the trial, favourable or unfavourable, in which a formal Apology was delivered and that Philostratus made of it whatever use suited his purposes can appear quite credible from a careful study of the speech. For example, at various intervals there are dramatic interruptions, where the accuser (8.7, ix) or Domitian (x) seem to be hastening Apollonius to fresh points, or where the accuser (xv) is chafing at the way Domitian listens to the speech. These important touches, which help to create the atmosphere of a court-room scene, are inadmissible in a speech which was prepared but not delivered.¹ Similarly when Apollonius begins to answer the indictment (8.7, iv), he says that there is no need for him to ask which of the charges he should first answer, since the prosecutor at the beginning of his speech had dwelt upon his ascetic way of life. But what speech? Where does Philostratus refer to any formal prosecution? In the earlier account of the trial it is the emperor who interrogates him, and the accuser, at most, reads out the indictment (8.4-5). It could be argued that Philostratus was sacrificing consistency for dramatic effect in these places. Further evidence, however, will show the possibility of an earlier source which contained a formal prosecution and defence, or of an Apology of Apollonius, albeit spurious, which existed by itself.²

A most extraordinary digression is to be found at 8.7, vii. In it Apollonius theorizes on the kinship of man and god and on the relationship of Creator to created. Such uncompromising philosophy is totally uncharacteristic of Philostratus's sage. Nowhere in the Life is there anything to approach this. A similar intensity of philosophical thought is to be seen only in one of the extant letters, the fifty-eighth, to Valerius on the occasion of his son's death--a letter which is generally believed to be authentic.³ At another stage in the

¹It would, of course, be ludicrous to imagine that these interruptions were anticipated by prescience, for the same faculty would have told the sage that his speech was unnecessary in the first place!

²The insertion of ΜΑΡΤΥΡΕΙΕ (8.7, xiv) is not difficult. A speaker could anticipate this in preparation.

³Valerius was governor of "hundred-cities" Asia, and the letter is dated at A.D. 82. See E. Norden, Agnostos Theos, p. 337; E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 412.

speech Apollonius begins to malign Euphrates, his real opponent, of whom the prosecutor was only a hired servant (8.7, xi). This agrees very closely with the reproaches contained in letters of the sage to Euphrates.¹ But this is also the one thing from which Philostratus in the Life excludes Apollonius in order to preserve his moral dignity.² Again, the account of the Ephesian plague seems to come from different sources as it appears in the Apology (8.7, ix) and in the earlier narrative (4.10). In the speech great emphasis is placed on the part played by Heracles, to whom Apollonius had evidently prayed. A statue was also set up to Heracles the Averter, when the pestilence was over. But in the earlier account Philostratus first speaks as if the statue were already there and later corrects himself by declaring that incident to be the occasion for its erection. In other respects, however, Heracles is not mentioned, nor is there any trace of Apollonius's light diet being put forward as the reason for his detection of the plague.³

The Apology, then, was neither the monograph of Philostratus nor the very speech which Apollonius had prepared. Philostratus would hardly have wanted to reject the idea of a prepared speech if it had been the case. There are, in fact, two possibilities; for it is obvious that the sophist has seen the need to combine two contrary traditions.

First, a version may have existed in which an Apology was actually delivered but which was extremely uncomplimentary to Apollonius. Philostratus himself refers to versions of the trial which "perverted the facts" (7.35). In that event, it may be expected that he would maintain his original position--that no speech was made--but at the same time compose an entirely different speech and introduce it somewhat awkwardly into his account in order to vindicate the sage. The prominence in this speech given to the sacrifice of a boy and the

¹See Letters 1-8, 14-18, 50-52, 60, 79-80.

²See ch. V p.126.

³Heracles is also said in the Apology to have helped with the detection of the Lamia at Corinth (8.7, ix), and here too the earlier passage (5.25) is silent on this.

Again, in the Life Apollonius appears to have only one brother (1.13), whereas in the Apology (8.7, iii) and in Letters 44, 55, and 91 it is perfectly clear that there were two or more brothers in the family. See also Appendix 1 p. 287.

conspiracy with Nerva will be part of the apologetic and originally foreign to Philostratus's sources.

But for this to be so more of the Apology would need to be assigned to Philostratus than the foregoing discussion will allow. I am led, therefore, to believe that Moeragenes, or whoever was responsible, was not the only one to preserve a formal speech delivered in fact. As will be demonstrated in a later chapter, there could well have existed a version of the trial which, so far from being uncomplimentary to Apollonius, actually told of his condemnation, execution, and resurrection as a divine being.¹ Nor is it necessary to suppose that favourable Apologies could not have existed in isolation, similar in nature to the contemporary Alexandrian nationalist Acts of the Pagan Martyrs. Any speech ennobling the character of Apollonius, even if it did not depict him as a successful pleader, could readily have been adopted by Philostratus and introduced into his books in as harmless a manner as possible.

So much for the writings of Apollonius, all of which Philostratus will have been able to consult. They will have told him much about the many sides to the sage's character. He seems to have misunderstood or ignored his philosophy; for we find little trace of any systematic thinking. But he had read enough to be able to criticize his literary and oratorical style (1.17). The extant letters add to our own knowledge of Apollonius; Philostratus could learn more from those that are now lost. Finally, he possessed a ready-made pattern for the laudatory Life in Apollonius's Life of Pythagoras. It may be no coincidence that he begins his work by setting forth Pythagoras as a prototype of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* before even mentioning Apollonius by name (1.1).

Local and verbal traditions

To perhaps the greater part of Philostratus's sources no name can be attached. There were various oral and written traditions discovered by the sophist in the course of his zealous researches.

At the outset Philostratus declares that he has collected his material partly from the many cities enamoured of Apollonius, partly from the many temples where he had restored long-neglected rites,

¹See below, ch. IX p. 273.

and partly from what others have said about him (1.2). Further evidence of these local sources is admitted throughout the work. Most notably, when he refers to Apollonius's descent into the cave of Trophonius, Philostratus admits to have "learnt the details from the inhabitants of Lebadea" (8.20). When speaking of his birth, he makes it clear that "the local people" vouch for the portent of the thunderbolt (1.4), and it was they also who called Apollonius the son of Zeus (1.6). With regard to the various traditions of his death, Philostratus gives fuller treatment to the Cretan story, as "the Cretans tell a more remarkable story than the people of Lindus" (8.30).

It would seem logical enough to expect that the narrative before Damis arrived on the scene (1.1-18) and after his memoirs close (8.29-31) should be dependent largely on local sources. Thus stories of Apollonius's birth are gleaned from Tyana and stories of his death from Ephesus, Lindus, and Crete. Damis gave no clue as to the age of Apollonius. By some means, however, Philostratus knew of three estimates (8.29). Moreover, the sage's beauty in his old age is to be seen from his statues in the temple at Tyana and from "accounts which sing the praises of (ὕμνοῦντες) his old age more enthusiastically than others once praised the youth of Alcibiades" (8.29).¹ The details of a day in his life at Antioch (1.16) are of local origin, for in the chapters where Damis is the alleged source Antioch is mentioned once only as a place the travellers were eager to pass over (3.58). The inhabitants of Pamphylia and Cilicia will have recalled most vividly his five years of silence, for it was in those regions that this period was spent (1.16).

Within that part of the work covered by the memoirs of Damis sources often appear to be at local level. This is particularly true of Book Four, where Damis is mentioned as a source only twice.² Books Four and Five contain the records of Apollonius's journeys through cities of the Greek and Roman world after his initiatory sojourn among the Indian sages. Everywhere he displays proof of his superior wisdom and power, and to this extent the two Books assume the form of "acta" (πράξεις), or reports of his achievements. What is more important,

¹Records of his life and works will, no doubt, have been kept in the temple at Tyana.

²See Appendix 2 p. 291.

the arrangement of material is episodic, and one can see plainly the headings which formed the rough notes of Philostratus: τὰ δὲ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τοιαῦτα (4.27, 4.31); κἀκεῖνο τῶν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι (4.33), ἔλθωμεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ἐν Ῥώμῃ σπουδὰς, αἱ ἐγένοντο αὐτῷ μετὰ τὰ ἐν Κρήτῃ (4.34), θαυμάσιον Ἀπολλωνίου κἀκεῖνο ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἔδοξε (5.42, cf. 4.45), τοιάδε μὲν αὐτῷ τὰ ἐν τῇ Ῥόδῳ (5.24). Although an itinerary may be set down, there is no idea of continuous narrative, no real chronological order. Every indication shows that the order and classification here is a personal one and that Philostratus is making good the gaps in Damis with all the extra material he had found.¹

Ephesus seems to have preserved a tradition of her own (4.2-4, 10; 7.5-7; 8.24-27). In addition to the story of the plague and the vision of Domitian's assassination Philostratus appears to be summarizing discourses (διαλέξεις) to which he clearly had access. The contents of similar homilies are given at Smyrna (4.7-9; 7.9) and Athens (4.22, cf. 19).² For his information on the Indian sages Philostratus quotes as well as Damis one of Apollonius's addresses (ὁμιλίαι) to the Egyptians (3.15). In the sage's reply to Thespesian, chief of the Egyptian gymnosophists,— apart from the Apology the longest speech in the whole work—we may be looking at the essential contents of that address (6.11). Whether it was preserved by Damis together, perhaps, with some discourses delivered at Athens (4.19) or whether copies of it were found in Egypt or elsewhere we cannot hope to know.

Finally, the last nine chapters of Book Six are in conspicuous isolation from the unusually chronological order of the previous series of events.³ The incidents described are all detached and probably of local origin: δυοῖν δὲ λόγων ἐν Σάρδεσι λεγομένων (6.37), ἄξιον δὲ καὶ τούτου ἐπιμνησθῆναι (39), κἀκεῖνα ἀξιομνημόνευτα εὐρον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς (40) κἀκεῖνα ἐν Ταρσοῖς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἄδουσι (43). These disconnected stories from Sardis, Antioch, Onidus, the Hellespont, Ionia

¹By comparing the relative detail in accounts of Apollonius's visits to various towns and cities it is possible to see how much local legend developed in each place.

²E. Norden, *op. cit.*, pp. 343ff., concludes somewhat hastily from 4.19 that the work On Sacrifices originally took the form of a discourse to the Athenians.

³There is a recognizable chronology in only the Indian journey (Books Two and Three) and the Egyptian episodes (Book Six). With 6.35-43 cf. also 1.15-17.

and Tarsus form a very weak transitional passage between the adventures of Apollonius in Egypt and the final conflict with Domitian at Rome. It may be that they are intended to give light relief before the major and involved themes of the following two Books are taken up.

It would be interesting to discover whether Philostratus himself assembled these various traditions or whether ready-made accounts of considerable detail were in circulation. He does say that he has travelled over most of the earth and has heard everywhere stories of Apollonius's divine nature (8.31). The opportunity to collect traditions of the near East was certainly provided by the journey of Julia Domna in A.D. 215. But it is possible that he found documents of a fairly comprehensive nature and that these saved him much trouble. A link may in fact be revealed between the Ephesian tradition of Apollonius's death (8.30) and the beginning of his journey to the East (1.18). In the earlier of the two passages the sage leaves Antioch with two attendants who belonged to his father's household, the one a writer of shorthand, the other a calligraphist. As soon as Damis joins the party (1.18), these two servants are heard of no more; they are superfluous in Damis' account. They reappear only at the very end, when Damis' memoirs have come to a close, but as freedmen and now dead (8.30). Their places have been taken by two maidservants who tend Apollonius at his death. It would be hazardous, therefore, to underestimate the extent to which Philostratus was helped by these local sources.

Maximus of Aegae

It may be conjectured that many of the local sources were the records of temple priests who at various times came under the influence of Apollonius's superior authority. However, one of the two specific sources which Philostratus gives by name was indeed a local one.

We know nothing of Maximus that is not recorded in Philostratus. He tells us that he came across a book by this man "in which was written all that Apollonius did in Aegae" (1.3). According to Eusebius, it was a very brief account of only part of his career (c. Hieroclem 3, cf. 2). Philostratus used it for chapters 7 to 12 in Book One, at the end of which he says, "These and many similar incidents are related by Maximus of Aegae, a man of commendable fluency who deserved his position

as imperial secretary".¹

Some have set Maximus with Damis as fictional characters. E. Meyer doubts that anyone would record only the history of a great man's youth, when it was of less consequence than what was to follow.² His arguments are not entirely convincing. The fact that Maximus is named only twice (1.3 and 12) is unimportant, as he is responsible at most for only six chapters (1.7-12). And if, as Meyer supposed, Philostratus needed other authorities to supplement his Damis, he would surely have done better than that. Moreover, Philostratus will hardly have made Maximus a member of the imperial staff if this could not be verified.³ But if he is treated as one of the many genuine local sources--the only one bearing a name--there is little difficulty. He receives the attention due to him, no more and no less. He would be responsible simply for compiling the traditions at Aegae, most of which he will have collected at the temple of Asclepius, where he says Apollonius served an initiatory apprenticeship.

Damis of Nineveh

The credibility and reality of Damis is a matter of persistent controversy. The problem has become unnecessarily intricate and is usually connected with the question of Philostratus's aims and intentions. But whatever these may have been,⁴ it does not follow that, if he was using this man's name as authority for his own statements in sections of the work, Damis never existed, or that Philostratus did not come into possession of his personal notes (leaving aside their importance and nature for the moment).

¹For this post "Ab Epistulis Graecis" in the Empire see G. B. Townend, "The post of Ab Epistulis in the Second Century", Historia 10 (1961), pp. 375-81. If Maximus served under a Severan emperor, his collection may have provided for Julia Domna her first opportunity to read about Apollonius.

²E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 402. See also F. Solmsen, Real-Encyclopädie XX p. 151-52. For Meyer's criticism of the source see below, pp. 155ff.

³Cf. G. W. Bowersock, Greek Sophist in the Roman Empire, pp. 19 n.2, 56, and in the Introduction to the Penguin translation, p. 11.

⁴See below, ch. VII.

At least three different positions may be taken up with regard to Damis. First, one can choose to believe absolutely in what Philostratus says about him, namely that he was a young contemporary and companion of Apollonius and his book a personal, if not entirely true, record of the events of the sage's life. He would then be a very important source for Philostratus, who, as he tells us, simply edited and adapted the rough and unpolished document for inclusion within his own publication (1.3). It is worth pausing to remember that this was the view of the ancients and is supported by what Eusebius and Hierocles say, even though the former doubted if Damis really told the truth.¹

In modern times this view has been championed, most notably, by G. R. S. Mead and J. Jessen. The theosophist Mead believed that Damis often misunderstood the words and deeds of Apollonius because he was only a follower not an initiated disciple. He could wonder at, but never fully comprehend, his nature.² Jessen thought it difficult to imagine that Philostratus would at the time of publication risk implicating the late empress in a literary fraud.³ Indeed what could be more natural than for a relative of Damis to expect a member of an imperial family, known to be particularly sensitive to the religious revival and syncretism of the time, to be interested in his kinsman's document. F. C. Conybeare, not unlike Mead, believed that many of the fabulous details did in fact come from Damis, who, in the fashion of the ἀρεταλόγοι of the day, sought to exaggerate trivial incidents so that they became wonders and to embellish the life of Apollonius into that of a superhuman being.⁴

Others are as convinced of Damis' reality as they are of the falsification of his account. There once existed, they say, a disciple of Apollonius by that name, but the memoirs which Philostratus

¹Eusebius c. Hieroclem 2 and 3; cf. passim. Tzetzes Chiliades 2. 973-75 names among his sources for Apollonius of Tyana Philostratus, Moeragenes and Maximus, but not Damis!

²G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., pp. 73f.

³J. Jessen, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

⁴F. C. Conybeare in the Introduction to the Loeb translation vol. 1 p. ix. Cf. E. Rohde, Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer (3rd ed. Leipzig, 1914), pp. 446-471 esp. n. 2 p. 468.

used were composed later by someone else. Inaccuracies and improbabilities give the real author away. The circumstances which accompanied its emergence are also gravely suspicious. Why was it hitherto unknown? Why did Julia Domna not give orders for it to be published? Why does Damis say so little about himself? The most J. S. Phillimore is prepared to admit is that these papers were the work of an oriental, not well-versed in Greek, a "credulous, enthusiastic, foolish, but loyally devoted Levantine".¹ Philostratus also will have taken them for what they were really worth. A modification of this second view was held by R. Reitzenstein, who supposed Damis to be a pseudonym adopted by a second-century Pythagorist in order to give credence to a transformed account in which he combined material from Moeragenes with a holy Reise-aretalogie.² Damis was not real, but the documents were real.

The third and most strongly contested theory about Damis states that he was a clever figment of Philostratus's imagination. Doubt was expressed by as early a scholar as the German F. C. Baur. In order to give the appearance of truth to fiction Philostratus needed an authority against whom no opposition could be taken. The disciple and witness of Apollonius was ideal for this role.³ This position is argued more impressively by E. Meyer, who sought to expose Damis' memoirs as a literary invention no more real than the work of Cid Hamed ben Engeli from which Cervantes derived his history of Don Quixote, or the inscription on the golden stele at Panchaea, where Euhemerus learnt the true story about the Greek Gods.⁴ It is true that the discovery of old documents even in the ancient world was for writers of fiction a regular part of the stock-in-trade. In addition to Euhemerus we may refer to the so-called Diary of

¹J. S. Phillimore, op. cit., p. xxii. See also O. de B. Priaulx, The Indian travels of Apollonius of Tyana etc. (London, 1873), pp. 56f.

²R. Reitzenstein, op. cit., pp. 40f. Cf. E. Norden, op. cit., p. 37 n.1.

³F. C. Baur, Apollonius von Tyana und Christus (Leipzig, 1876, repr. Hildesheim, 1966), p. 112f.

⁴E. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 372, 383. Cf. F. Leo, Die Griechisch-römische Biographie (Leipzig, 1901), p. 261; E. H. Haight, More Essays on Greek Romances (New York, 1945), p. 85; cf. J. Miller, Philologus 66 (1907), pp. 516ff.

Dictys (a companion of Idomeneus at Troy) which was allegedly discovered during Nero's reign but actually composed in the second or third century A.D. The tablets of Deinias, hero of Antonius Diogenes' romance (c. A.D. 100) were also said to have been found in the time of Alexander the Great.¹ But the work of Philostratus should not be confused with writings of unadulterated fiction. It was an attempt at biography and set within a comparatively historical framework.

Both Meyer and Baur assigned a tendentious spirit to the work, the one discerning as Philostratus's aim a rehabilitation of Apollonius as sage instead of sorcerer, the other his adoption as pagan counterpart to Christ.² It is clear, however, that only if Philostratus is providing for Apollonius a radically new image, hitherto unknown, will the invention of Damis be seen as a requisite for his interpretation. This in turn will mean that Philostratus invented everything he wrote, including his reference to Maximus and other local sources and presumably the interest of Julia Domna in Apollonius prior to his writing.³ Contradictory traditions certainly existed, but although Moeragenes wrote before Philostratus, there is no evidence to show that the unfavourable tradition was prior to the favourable one. Indeed a man of Apollonius's remarkable talents laid himself open to instant misrepresentation as god or devil by those who worshipped or loathed him. Two opposing legends were built up out of two different responses to him among his contemporaries.

Nevertheless, the argument is further strengthened by reference to the text. Meyer cannot believe that Damis first mentioned the plain facts which Philostratus simply dressed up in style and rhetorical colouring. Take away the dressing, he says, and nothing is left.⁴

¹W. R. Halliday, Folklore Studies Ancient and Modern (London, 1924), compares Damis to Walter of Oxford, who was Geoffrey of Monmouth's authority for the early kings of Britain and especially for the glorification of his obscure Welsh hero Arthur.

²See below, ch. VII pp. 202ff.

³G. W. Bowersock, Introduction to the Penguin translation, p. 17, thinks the possibility of real and imaginary sources not inconceivable. He refers to a similar "symbiosis" in the Augustan History.

⁴"Inhalt und Form gehören untrennbar zusammen, das ganze Wesen des Werkes besteht in dieser stilischen Aufmachung" (E. Meyer, op. cit., p. 378).

The description of Babylon, Meyer believed, came not from Damis but from Herodotus, and the romantic and topographical details of the Indian journey from Ctesias and the historians of Alexander. Interest in works of art, tapestries, inscriptions, statues, and so forth, is to be expected not from the uncultured Assyrian, but from the author of the Imagines. But why not add the preoccupation with legends and literature, the erudite allusions and marvellous anecdotes for which Philostratus in catering for tastes of the time was undoubtedly responsible?¹ This need not weaken any belief in a Damis-source. Where the pen of Philostratus is so obviously at work, Damis is never mentioned specifically as authority.² As far as concerns the geographical information, cross-references do not necessarily prove dependence and, what is more, there are items in Philostratus's "Indian" books which, so far as we know, are original and unattested elsewhere. If these were not invented, they will have been derived from Damis.³

Criticism of Philostratus should not be confused with criticism of Damis. Whatever the nature of his memoirs, there is every reason to believe in the existence of both them and him. Not only does Philostratus appear to edit and summarize his source, he also comments on, selects from, and sometimes contradicts it.⁴ It is perhaps sufficient that Julia Domna's name is associated with the book. Its significance and value for Philostratus is a different matter.⁵ A journal or diary is the kind of thing a relative of Damis is likely to possess. It may be hoped to contain little more than a log of the travels. But such a chronology and itinerary, however meagre,

¹Classification of the relevant passages is to be found in the following chapter. See below, pp.167ff.

²On two occasions Damis is mentioned at the very beginning of a chapter but as source for its essence and not necessarily for the specific details it contained (1.24; 6.3). Elsewhere a *φασί* is inserted or nothing at all. See Appendix 2 pp. 290f.

³Philostratus is not afraid to name his authorities where he does owe dependence. Thus Juba is cited for the information on elephants (2.13) and Nearchus for the River Acesines (2.17).

⁴See Appendix 2 pp.291ff.

⁵These *ὑπομνήματα* (1.19) were called by Damis *ἐκφάνισματα*, scraps, remnants, i.e. that which is cleared out of the manger. Cf. Athenodorus 6.270d.

could well be combined by the sophist with his other sources. Other items can be specified only if it is accepted that wherever Damis is quoted as authority Philostratus is using the journal. This is not improbable, for the number of times where it does occur is not so vast in comparison with other citations that are used.¹ There are also considerable gaps in the work, where Damis as a source is absent altogether.² Finally, it must be reiterated that nowhere is Damis' authority cited for what is blatantly the work of Philostratus.³

The Historicity of Apollonius

This examination of the sources for Apollonius of Tyana is now complete. We have seen how our knowledge of Apollonius is almost entirely dependent on Philostratus; yet from his books a host of sources both favourable and disparaging may be surmised. Our aim has been to try to show what possibility Philostratus had of knowing the facts of Apollonius's life and of being able to report them with historical accuracy. He declares it his intention to give the true picture and to present in full the biography which until that time had not been available to the public (1.2). It is certainly possible that he could have accomplished this purpose; for a profusion of credible material apparently came into his hands. But did he accomplish it? The accuracy of Philostratus's portrait has for various reasons frequently been questioned. Quite apart from the strong certainty that he was writing with ulterior motivation, there are chronological and other difficulties which need to be answered if any conclusion is to be formed concerning the historicity of his Apollonius.

Chronology

Chronological uncertainties have been used to weaken the historical reliability of Philostratus's portrait. But as biographer rather

¹ See Appendix 2 p. 290.

² See Appendix 2 p. 291.

³ Sometimes Damis is not authority for details but simply dramatis persona. His splendid characterization on these occasions is partly, no doubt, due to Philostratus. See Appendix 2 p.290.

than historian Philostratus may be said never to have intended any precise chronology. It may even be doubted whether he knew the dates of many major incidents in Apollonius's life. He is unsure of his age at death and does not mention the year of his birth.¹

There are, of course, some events which may be dated externally. The vision of Domitian's assassination must have occurred on September 18, A.D. 96 (8.26). Apollonius was at Corinth (4.24) seven years before Nero's attempt to cut through the Isthmus, i.e., A.D. 60. He visited Vardanes (1.28) during the third year of his reign, i.e. A.D. 44. Less precisely, it may be asserted that Apollonius travelled to Spain shortly before Nero's death (5.10), that he visited Alexandria at about the time of Vespasian's rise to power (5.37), and that he ended his life on earth sometime under Nerva (8.27). Apollonius's age at the time of certain incidents is also given. He reached his twentieth birthday while serving Asclepius at Aegae (1.13). Assistance to the exiled Eretrians in Asia was rendered by him "while still a young man" (1.24). He is already fairly old when he meets the Egyptians (6.11), and the period which had elapsed since he left India until the time of his trial was one of thirty-eight years (8.7, xi).

Elsewhere, however, the chronology is not so intelligible. The historical allusion to the deposition by Tiberius of King Archelaus (1.12) dates the adolescence of Apollonius to c. A.D. 17. This would put the date of his birth as far back as the turn of the century and would give him a lifetime of nearly one hundred years. But in order to make up this number it is necessary to maintain that in Philostratus's narrative there are two large and unexplained gaps, each one covering twenty years. After his five years of silence, begun sometime after he was twenty-one (1.13-14), Apollonius journeyed to Babylon. If Vardanes was Parthian king at the time, the journey to Babylon or the time spent prior to this in Antioch (1.15-16) will have lasted some twenty years. The earthquake in Crete which the sage interprets as the effect of a new island in the Mediterranean (4.34), is dated by Seneca in the year A.D. 46 (Q. Nat. 6.21). In the very next chapter (4.35)

¹The question of chronology has been examined in particular by J. S. Phillimore, op. cit., pp. cv-cxxv and, before him, by W. M. Flinders Petrie, Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity (London, 1909), pp. 138ff. The conclusions of Petrie are untenable, those of Phillimore not entirely satisfactory.

Apollonius is in Rome and Telesinus is consul (A.D. 66). It is possible that he spent considerable time in Crete and this was omitted by Damis or abbreviated by Philostratus. There may have been a local tradition, for Philostratus makes the transition by the awkward phrase, "let us cut a long story short" (4.34).¹

But the truth is that in Philostratus chronology is perfunctory from the start. If in 4.34 the date is A.D. 46, then, according to Philostratus, ten chapters earlier (4.24) an event was narrated more than ten years ahead of time, i.e., A.D. 60.² By 4.35 not only is the missing decade made up, but altogether two decades are added for good measure. The order in Philostratus is plainly not chronological, but one of artistic arrangement. Events in Books Four and Five are classified not according to time but to place. The itinerary cannot always follow a chronological order. Apart from what brief outline the memoirs of Damis contained, Philostratus had learnt a vast number of details from local sources, and it must have been impossible to attempt to fit every incident into a strict chronological sequence. In any case, such precision, necessary for a historian, may not have worried Philostratus a biographer. He was prepared to risk anachronism in the earlier part of his Life in order that Apollonius might live beyond the highest human age, as befits a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, and at the same time end his life shortly after his conflict with Domitian. His purpose was not to indicate the exact moment in time of each event, but to comprise within the general limits of a lifetime and to fit into historical context those many incidents of which the majority of accounts contained no chronological order. It is on these terms alone that the portrait of Apollonius can be accepted.³

¹The alternative is to believe the story to be apocryphal. See J. S. Phillimore, op. cit., pp. cxx f. Other gaps of smaller significance may be observed between the accessions of Vespasian and Titus as emperors and between the interview with Titus and the trial under Domitian. The earlier gaps may be explained by 6.35, where at the beginning travels are overtly omitted, probably because they had already been inserted earlier, out of chronological order, in Books Four and Five.

²I.e. Apollonius at the Isthmus of Corinth. See above, p. 159.

³For a probable chronology of Apollonius's life see Appendix 3 p.295.

Textual "improbabilities"

Further improbabilities in the text tend to support the notion that Philostratus had no compunction to write with historical precision. For example, the existence of Vardanes is readily attested (see Tacitus, Annals 11.8f.); but he was king of Parthia not Babylon, which was at that time a city of little importance in the Parthian Empire. The accounts of the philosopher Euphrates seem not to concur with what we know of him in other sources.¹ The stand made by Demetrius against Nero and his consequent banishment are related in a manner which cannot wholly be reconciled with the facts and dates of Roman history.² These and other inconsistencies are pointed out the more quickly by historians.³ It would be a fruitless task even to attempt to answer every historical inaccuracy; indeed most of them cannot be answered. But is it really to be expected that Philostratus, a Greek, even less Damis, an Assyrian, should possess more than superficial knowledge of the history of Rome under the early Empire? The sophist's interest was solely in Apollonius and in what his sources said of him. Where he was able to correct them he did so, but innumerable details are likely to be overlooked. Inaccuracy does not necessarily imply fiction.

Eusebius spoke of absurdities in the Life, and modern opinion was quick to reiterate much of what he said. There are times when both are grossly unfair.⁴ The faculty of prescience in Apollonius was ridiculed in that there were many things he failed to foresee (Eusebius c. Hieroclem 15; cf. 24, 29, 36, 37). But nowhere does Philostratus claim for him omniscience.⁵ Further criticism is aimed

¹Cf. Pliny Ep. 1.10, where the more attractive side of Euphrates is displayed. But see P. Grimal, "Deux Figures de la Correspondance de Pline", Latomus 14 (1955), pp. 370ff., for an assessment of his character.

²See G. W. Bowersock, Introduction to the Penguin translation, p. 17f.; D. Dudley, A History of Cynicism (London, 1937), p. 126 n.l.

³In c. Hieroclem 30 Eusebius confuses the mad dog of VA 6.43 with the tame lion of 5.42. Among modern critics F. C. Baur and E. Meyer are perhaps the fiercest.

⁴Eusebius admits this in c. Hieroclem 31. The reference in VA 7.14 to the knowledge of all things does not specifically refer to foreknowledge.

⁵Similarly Eusebius wonders why Apollonius, a Pythagorean, consented to eat the vital organs of serpents in order to understand the language of birds (c. Hieroclem 10). But Philostratus states merely the fact that the Arabs who taught him had themselves acquired their knowledge in that manner.

at Apollonius's claim to understand all men's languages (1.19). Why, then, asks Eusebius (14) did he need an interpreter when speaking to the Indian king who visited the Brahmin sages? Indeed why did he speak to Phraotes by means of an interpreter (2.25)? The inconsistency disappears if it is remembered that Apollonius claims only to have "understood" not openly to have spoken all languages. A passage from the Apology may be compared (8.7, vii), where he is at a loss to explain why men worship him, "for", he says, "I never spoke among the Greeks of successive transmigrations of my soul, although I knew what these were".¹ On the frontiers of Babylon, however, Apollonius astonishes the satrap by the fact that he does not require an interpreter (1.21).

By far the most widespread criticism is directed against the Indian travels of Apollonius (c. Hieroclem 16-22). Modern scholars have branded these travellers' tales as fable and fantasy, sometimes because items in Philostratus are also found in other Indica, sometimes because they occur not at all elsewhere! It is so easy glibly to dismiss the fabulous details of India as essentially dependent upon Ctesias, the historians of Alexander, Strabo, Pliny, Arrian, and Aelian.² What is often unappreciated is the fact that only the general similarity of situation corresponds, not the details of the various descriptions. In other words, it would be natural for Philostratus in an account of India to mention the traditions about Dionysus, to describe the great rivers of the country, and to tell of its animals real and imaginary. These delightful stories were the common stock-in-trade of all writers on India. But genuine cross-references

¹Parallel references have been noted by U. de B. Priaulx, op. cit., pp. 1-62. In most cases, however, the subject of description is the parallel, the details of its description are quite different. See also the next note.

E. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 376f., believed that Philostratus simply altered the names of places he had read about in Arrian (e.g. VA 3.53 Βίβλος = Βεβακτα Arr. Ind. 21; VA 3.54 Πηγάδες = Παγαλα Arr. Ind. 27). But would an author wishing to deceive his readers into accepting as true an invented journey change real for imaginary place-names?

²The fabulous creatures of Strabo 15.1, 57 are different from the ones described in Philostratus. The type alone is the corresponding factor. Similarly the details of the Prometheus legend (VA 2.3) are different in Strabo 15.1, 8; cf. Arrian 5.3. Cf. also divergences in the accounts of monkeys (VA 3.4 and Strabo 15.1, 29) and the Brahmins (VA 3.10ff. and Arrian 8.10-17, Strabo 15.1, 59, and 70).

are more difficult to trace.¹ Indeed certain facts apparently from Damis are, as far as we know, unattested elsewhere.² Examples of originality are, of course, no more a guarantee for the accuracy of Damis' information than for inventiveness on Philostratus's part. Men's knowledge of India at that time was very much a matter of hearsay, unfamiliar place-names were confused and, more important, the vagueness and mysterious quality about the distant land inclined the reading public to expect tales of unfathomable wonder. At the same time, it was prudent to state one's own reservations on their historical value. Both Arrian and Strabo see the need for caution, and Philostratus, who sees no harm in a description of the wonders on the hill of the Brahmins, nevertheless makes Apollonius ask the Indians which of their mythical animals really do exist!²

That Apollonius did visit wise men in India is by no means improbable. Alexander's expedition had already provided greater opportunity for friendly intercourse between the Greek and Indian worlds. The influence each would have on the other is obvious. It is further supported by Apollonius's discovery among the Brahmins of images of the Greek gods (3.14). Moreover, all the inhabitants of the neighbouring village spoke Greek (3.12).³ But this does not secure for us the accuracy of Philostratus's Indian narrative. Strange

¹Examples of Damis' originality are cited by O. de B. Priaulx as follows: temple mosaics at Taxila (2.20); the Caucasus range stretching down to the Indian Ocean (3.4); the monkeys and pepper trees (3.4); the marriage unguent (3.1); the Hill of the sages with its crater-fire of Pardon and the caskets of wind and rain (3.14); the cup of Tantalus (3.32); and a local habitation for Homer's autonomous tripods (3.27, cf. Il. 18.375).

²VA 3.45. Cf. Arrian 8.6; Strabo 15.1, 2.

³Nicolaus of Damascus says that he met at Antioch Epidaphne in 22 B.C. Indian ambassadors on their way to meet Augustus and that their letters of credentials were in Greek (Strabo 15.1, 73; Nicolaus fr. 91, cf. FHG III 5. p. 419 Didot.). The embassy is alluded to in Hor. Carm. Saec. 55f., cf. Carm. 4.14, and 1.12; cf. Dio Cass. 54.9. For other Indian embassies to the Roman emperors cf. Pliny HN 6.24 (under Claudius), Dio Cass. 58.15, and 29 (under Trajan), and Aurelius Victor Epit. 16 (under Antoninus Pius). See also O. de B. Priaulx, op. cit., pp. 65, 91, 125ff. Dio Chrys. Or. 53.277 shows that Homer was read and translated by the Indians; cf. also Or. 35 for Indians at Alexandria. On the worship of Greek gods by Indians cf. Plutarch De Alex. fort. 328c.

names and extraordinary details to be found in Damis' notes may well have forced him to rely upon the supplementary aid of his own memory and of his own imagination. He will have made the most of one certain fact, namely that Apollonius was seeking out a community of wise men, and will have described this as if it were the only one of its kind in India.¹

It is possible that more than one religious community was visited. Philostratus does seem to be combining in the one fraternity the distinct features of both Brahmin and Buddhist sages. A community of anchorites one associates with Buddhism; the Brahmins tended to live alone in separate huts. Other marks of Buddhism are the mode of election by merit and character (3.30) and not by caste, the staff they carry, and the single garment worn so as to leave one shoulder bare (3.15).² On the other hand, it is Brahmins who wear long hair and turbans (3.15), whereas Buddhist monks shave their heads. Brahmins hold the doctrine of the world as a living soul (atman, brahma cf. 3.34). Finally the caste-mark on the herald's head (3.11) suggests a closed system, as was the brahminical family priesthood. Perhaps Apollonius visited both Brahmins and Buddhists in India, but the confused account of Damis was misunderstood by Philostratus.³ It may be that there was little consistency in ancient accounts on the wise men of India. Strabo, for example, speaks of two "Brahmins" at Taxila, of whom one had a

¹ See G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p. 77.

² ἑξωμίς (3.15). Cf. Pliny HN 19.4 for this garment.

³ In VA 1.18 Apollonius desires to visit "Brahmins and Hyrcanians". But the latter are altogether ignored. Ancient writers refer to Brahmins and Sa(r)manaei as two distinct sects in India (Clemens Alex. Strom. 1.110; 3.194; Jerome Ep. contra Jovian. 1.2, 39; Origen c. Celsum 1.24; Strabo 15.1, 61, cf. 65, 66, 70). The clearest distinction between the two makes it fairly certain that the Samanaei were Buddhists (Bardesanes apud Porph. De Abst. 4.17). It is possible that Philostratus, mystified by the presence in Damis of the word Σαρμαναίοι (a Greek corruption of the Sanskrit Shramana and Pâli Samana, technical terms for a Buddhist ascetic), altered it to Ὑρκάνιοι, the name of a people south of the Caspian Sea and en route to India, and then forgot all about it. See also O. de B. Priaulx, op. cit., pp. 132, 138ff.; G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p. 72.

shaven head and the other wore long hair (15.1, 61).¹ Indeed there is a strong possibility that in Apollonius's time Brahmins, like Buddhists, had begun to live together in communities rather than as solitary hermits, and that one of their number was accepted as a leader among individuals of the same standing.² If such communities did exist the likelihood for Apollonius to have come across one, or even more, on the northern boundaries of India is far from remote. Any improbability will lie only in the significance attributed to this by Philostratus and in the way he described it.

Historical context for Apollonius

The more historical a basis is found for Philostratus's portrait, the more justification there is for believing that of the two Apollonius was a benevolent *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* rather than a *γόνυ* of questionable character. The difficulties have been exaggerated, but there may be sufficient doubt to merit a brief glance at the general atmosphere of the age in which Apollonius lived in order to ascertain how far he fits into the context of the first century A.D. It will be partly the scope of the next chapter to decide to what extent, if there is genuine conformity to the times, this is the work of Philostratus.

Towards the end of Hellenism but before the days of imperial Rome a flood of new influences had come streaming into Italy from the near East. It was a time of intense religious atmosphere. The universal religions of Cybele, Mithras, and Serapis gave new hope to those who desired a personal faith instead of the cold and comfortless philosophy of Zeno or Epicurus. At the same time, men looked away from the ideal sage or king of Stoic and Cynic conception in order to find a real living sage, an earthly king, who could guide them in the paths directed by the gods. It was with similar "messianic" hope

¹The differences between the two major religions in India, Buddhism and Hinduism (as the religion of Brahmins later became known), may not have been widely understood. Of the historians who accompanied Alexander only Megasthenes recognized a distinction (Strabo 14.1, 61, 65, 66). Bardesanes, quoted by Porphyry (in the previous note), was roughly contemporary with Philostratus.

²This point I owe to Dr. Karl Werner of the Department of Oriental Studies in the University of Durham.

that Augustus was greeted. After his death it was clear that one needed to look in a different direction for a spiritual director who could show divine light in the moral darkness of the times.

The first two centuries of the Empire have been called an age of spiritual longings and pious credulity.¹ All forms of divination, revelation, or access to the divine were eagerly welcomed. Miracles, omens, dreams, and other providences were recorded without a moment's hesitation by dilettantes like Aelian and Artemidorus, as well as by historians like Tacitus and Suetonius. Syncretism was in the air and with it came the trend towards monotheism. Individuality and precision in worship and ritual were gradually being lost. Into this world were born the new Pythagorist and Platonist movements, both part of a great spiritual trend which made the aim of philosophy almost identical with that of religion, namely the right knowledge of god.²

However, long before these two schools came into their own the voice of the Cynic teacher had been heard in protest against man's preoccupation with material things. The vagrant missionary had become an increasingly accepted figure. Hermotimus struggled for twenty years to achieve only one step on the upward road, Dio Chrysostom preached as a sacred duty, and Demonax was worshipped at Athens for nearly a hundred years.³

Apollonius also was a true representative of the new spiritual movement, transforming Pythagorism into a philosophical religion as he travelled through the world as its missionary prophet. He preached a higher, more spiritual knowledge of god, and worship not through the conventional sacrifices but by purity of life. Yet this was combined, it seems, with a call to observe ancient ritual of the old religion. Spirituality, monotheism, syncretism, there is nothing here that does not conform to the mood and temper of the age to which Apollonius belonged.⁴

¹S. Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius (repr. New York, 1957), pp. 384ff.

²Ibid. p. 397.

³Dio Chrysost. Or. 78; Lucian Hermotimus 2-6, Demonax 63.

⁴The historical accuracy of Philostratus has been defended by F. Grosso in Acme 7 (1954), pp. 333ff. I have not been able to obtain this or the following two articles: B. A. van Groningen, Bulletin de la faculté des lettres de Strasbourg 30, 1951-2, 107ff.; Th. Hopfner, Seminar Kondakov 4 (1931) 135ff. (See Bibliography for full references.)

CHAPTER VII

PHILOSTRATUS (III) MOTIVATION AND INTERPRETATION

If the discussion of the previous chapter has revealed one thing it is that for our knowledge of Apollonius we are almost entirely obliged to Philostratus. It has been suggested, however, that although it was possible for him to write with historical precision, he does not appear to be too concerned about the extraneous historical facts of the period. But if he was not a historian, he is not in the least detached and impartial even as a biographer. It is now time to see what reasons Philostratus may have had for writing the way he did about Apollonius. For we are dealing with his interpretation of the life of Apollonius. This was the Apollonius whom he saw and whom he wished his readers to see. It was for him nevertheless the true Apollonius: if it was an ideal representation, it was as such the only representation worthy of our attention. To this extent Plato's Socrates, the Pythagoras of later neo-Platonists, and Philostratus's Apollonius are products of the same Greek mould.

The work is of a thoroughly complex structure. There is no one single aim but many, some of which stand out in prominent conspicuity whereas others are of comparative unimportance.

Rhetoric and Ostentation

The first and most obvious motivation for a writer of Philostratus's calibre has nothing whatsoever to do with Apollonius. No sophist could resist the temptation to display his rhetorical skills and love of learning. How else do we explain in a work ostensibly recording the life of a wise man constant references to legend and mythology, to events and personages in history, and countless literary allusions

especially to Homer and the tragedians?¹ Undoubtedly Philostratus is conscious of the cultural tastes and intellectual dispositions of the readers whom he hoped to attract to his book.² He lived in an age of rhetorical prose writings and encyclopaedic knowledge to which belong the miscellanies of Aelian, Athenaeus, and Favorinus; an age which he himself christened the "Second Sophistic". Characteristic of the whole Life of Apollonius are the interest in geographical detail, in music, in art and architecture, and the careful descriptions of temples, other buildings, works of art, and inscriptions.³ Dreams also were now attracting the attention of serious men, and Philostratus is not slow to attribute to Apollonius some meaningful interpretations.⁴

The episodic nature of the work is well-suited to the above features. The main narrative is easily interspersed with practically independent ἐκφράσεις⁵ or set pieces which display the sophist's multifarious knowledge. These idylls sometimes form only part of one chapter, but often they extend over several chapters in length. Typical of the longer pieces is the information on elephants (2.11-16), the dragons of India (3.6-8), the hill of the sages (3.13-14), and the night spent

¹A full list of relevant references is given in Appendix 4. Here may be observed, for example, the significance of Babylon instead of Parthia for Vardanes' kingdom (1.25ff.). Historical accuracy is readily sacrificed for a literary echo of Herodotus.

²See in particular B. A. Van Groningen, "General Literary Tendencies in the Second Century A.D.", in Mnemosyne 18 (1965), pp.41ff., where the temperament of the period is fully analysed.

³See Appendix 4.

⁴Appendix 4. Artemidorus compiled his book on dreams towards the close of the second century A.D.

⁵The word ἐκφράσεις is used by Callimachus for the title of a book on works of art. The Second Sophistic has been compared to Alexandria in the Hellenistic Age, where similar predilections for episodic (εἰδύλλια) poetry were held. The poems of Theocritus are full of ἐκφράσεις which stand apart as self-contained units within the larger wholes.

at Achilles' tomb (4.11-16). A favourite form of rhetorical ostentation (ἐπίδειξις) is the list of famous examples, of which the most conspicuous is the list of previous philosophers who had stood their ground against tyrants as Apollonius had done against Domitian (7.1-3). Wise men who accepted money as gifts (1.34), parental love in animals (2.14), famous soothsayers (8.7, xv), and philosophical systems (6.11) are also listed. There are times when unimportant incidents in the original sources seem to have been expanded by Philostratus into independent episodes.¹ Expansion and elaboration are, however, the tools of a good rhetorician and may be a general characteristic of the whole work. We may not be able to discover to what extent the facts were plainly revealed and how far they were disguised, but that they were remoulded in a more ornate style is the emphatic declaration of Philostratus (1.3).

A resemblance between Apollonius and Socrates, though not as strong as that between him and Pythagoras, is evident particularly in the various discourses which take the form of Platonic dialogues. Like Socrates, Apollonius is supposed to turn commonplace subjects into lofty themes.² But the purpose of the sophist may be not to recall the Athenian θεῖος ἄνθρωπος --which is adequately achieved in the trial and Apology--but to emulate the dialectic style of writing which Plato had perfected to an art.

The long speeches contain much that is so highly rhetorical that it may be not imprudent to attribute the greater part of them to Philostratus. This will be in addition to the natural expectation that the writer is following the accepted practice in "uttering the sentiments which seemed appropriate to the occasion, keeping very closely to the gist of what was really said".³ The first lengthy soliloquy of Apollonius, about his interview with Achilles' ghost (4.16), is now

¹Cf. the Nilus episode (6.15-17), where the narrative is unusually dramatic.

²E.g. 2.5 (mountaineering and religion), 22 (painting), 35 (drinking and divination); 5.14-17 (Aesop and mythology), 21 (flute-playing); 8.18 (festivals). Cf. also 4.30, 32; 5.22-23; 6.18-21, 30-32; 7.11-15.

³Thuc. 1.22.

thought to be the work of Philostratus himself and a foretaste of things to come in the Heroicus.¹ The speech to the gymnosophists in Egypt (6.11) is, with the exception of the Apology, by far the longest in the work and is itself almost another apologia pro vita sua.² Besides its very evident rhetorical colouring, the theme of 6.11--the Pythagorean choice of Apollonius--is a type of suasoria for a sophist, the prime example of which is Prodicus's "The Choice of Heracles", to which reference in the text is actually made.³ The same could almost be said about the advice given to Vespasian on kingship (5.36), for which Dio Chrysostom in his discourses had already set the pattern.⁴ Again, what is to be made of the speeches by Phraotes, Iarchus, Vespasian, Euphrates, Dio, and others? Were the original words included in the little journal of Damis? Or is it not more reasonable to believe that in so many of the speeches Philostratus, working on the brief notes of Damis, is presenting in elaborate form what each speaker may be expected to have said under the circumstances? If he did that and no more, although he made no claim to be writing history, he was by ancient standards achieving no less than a historian.

Romantic Elements

If a limit must be set to the historical worth of the Life of Apollonius, there is no justification for renouncing it as a fictitious romance. It is true, the work shares many identical features with the Greek romances.⁵ Not to mention the similar characteristics and virtues of heroes and heroines, we may compare the lively and rapid narrative,

¹F. Solmsen, "Some Works of Philostratus the Elder", in T A P A 71 (1940), pp.556ff., especially p.565.

²Cf. 7.14 (to Demetrius at Rome).

³The superiority of Indian over Egyptian wisdom is another theme in 6.11. Cf. Lucian Fugitivi 8. On this see R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, pp.42ff.; F. Solmsen in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopadie xx (1941) p.144; Meyer, op.cit., p.393.

⁴Dio Chrys. Or. 1-4 (to Trajan).

⁵See E. H. Haight, More Essays on Greek Romances (New York, 1945), pp. 81ff. For characteristics common to the ἥρωϊς ἀνήρ and the hero or heroine of Greek Romance see the classifications of L. Bieler, op. cit., I passim.

its strong story line and colourful descriptions, the shallow depth of much of the Greek prose writings of the time, and their appeal rather to the eye than to the mind. Melodrama both in Philostratus and in the Greek romances is maintained by the frequent changes of scenery, the world-wide travels, the entertaining digressions and sub-plots, the opposition of good and evil together with the final victory of the pure and chaste hero or heroine over the evil adversary. The episodic nature of Romance is matched in Philostratus by the conclusion of one series of events at the end of one book and the introduction of a new theme at the beginning of the next book. But here the analogy must stop. The extant Greek romances were essentially love-stories containing their own stock characters and common elements which were not to be found in Philostratus.

Historical Novel?

There were, however, other romances which did not wholly fit into the above scheme. The Latin novels of Petronius and Apuleius incorporate respectively a satirical and a semi-religious design. Philostratus is different again. If the Life of Apollonius is a romance, it is to be distinguished from other romances by its strong historical setting. There is more than just a historical background, as is provided for at least one of the five extant Greek romances.¹ Many of the dramatis personae are important historical personages, and much of the action, far from being imaginary, follows the known pattern of the history of the period.² The quite distinct romances of Alexander which find a representative at this time in Pseudo-Callisthenes (c. A.D. 200) should be compared. This genre within a genre may have had its beginning shortly after Alexander's death with an elaborate glorification of the hero in light-hearted attempts to

¹Chariton's Chaeris and Callirhoe is set in fifth-century Greece with the heroine as daughter of the Syracusan general, Hermocrates.

²Not to mention the Roman emperors and Tigellinus, the consul Telesinus (A.D. 66) and the prefect Aelian (Dio Cass. 68.3,3) are both attested; Dio and Euphrates were both contemporaries of Apollonius; Demetrius and Musonius were prominent philosophers at Rome; Vardanes, Vindex, Scopelianus, and Philolaus are all historical figures. That Euphrates did come into contact with Apollonius is clear from the reference in Origen c.Cels. 6.41. See above, p.131.

write on a historical subject.¹

But if Philostratus was near in time to Pseudo-Callisthenes, he was nearer in spirit to the author of the Cyropaedia, perhaps the earliest example of a historical novel. The definition, however, is still inadequate. Neither Philostratus nor Xenophon had the skill, far less the inclination, to do for their subjects what, for example, a John Buchan has done for Augustus. It is true that each was writing romantically about a man of flesh and blood and was careful, so far as he could, to preserve the historical situation and to avoid what anachronisms were not essential to his purpose. But neither of them cared to conceal what his further purpose was: Xenophon was really portraying his ideal ruler with Cyrus as exalted model; Philostratus elevated Apollonius of Tyana to represent his conception of the ideal saint and sage. Historical novel as a definition is only partly true, for it was the framework to support an altogether more explicit design.

Vera Historia?

It still remains to answer those who would question the artless sincerity of that design. For the work may be no more than a ψεύδος in the guise of history written chiefly with a view to pleasing and amazing its readers.

This category of travellers' tales and wonder-stories splendidly parodied by Lucian in his Verae Historiae and at the beginning of his Philopseudes is attested by Strabo and appears to have enjoyed both oral and literary moulds.² The aim was to delight rather than to convince, but the pious credulity of the age was sure to enhance the success of Philostratus. This theory would be supported in part by the numerous accounts of θαύματα in the Life of Apollonius: the

¹ J. U. Powell, New Chapters in Greek Literature, Series III, (1953), sees the Novel as a degenerate form of history. The five extant Greek novels are at the further end of this development; the Cyropaedia would come at its beginning as a semi-fictional account, and the Alexander-romances would provide greater evolution. The lost "Ninus-Romance" tends to support this theory. But a more comprehensive origin of romance is to be found in traditional story-telling; if you like, epic in prose.

² Strabo 11.6,3 - ... ὡθήσαν καὶ αὐτοὶ παρέξεσθαι τὴν γραφὴν ἡδέϊαν, εἴαν ἐν ἱστορίᾳ στήματι λέγουσιν, ἃ μηδέποτε εἶδον μηδὲ ἤκουσαν, ἢ οὐκ ἀπὸ γε εἰδότητων, σκοποῦντες αὐτὸ μόνον τοῦτο, ὅτι ἀκρόαθιν ἡδέϊαν ἔχει καὶ θαύμασθῆν. On ψεύδος and history cf. Cic. Leg. 1.1, 3-5; Pl. Resp. 376e-392c; Hor. Ars P. 151f.

wonderful birth, the fabulous Indian journey, demons, satyrs, ghosts and vampires. It may be that in many of the wondrous details Philostratus expected no one to take him too seriously. In his account of mythological creatures in India (3.45) the reason given for its inclusion is that there is profit in neither believing nor disbelieving everything. The profit to be gained from so uncritical an attitude was the popular success of these marvels whether simply recited or put into literary form.

The teller of tall tales was indeed a popular character in the ancient world.¹ Plato took Odysseus' *'Απόλογος Ἀλκίνοῦ* as the basic pattern (Resp. 614b). Juvenal referring to the same story calls its narrator a mendax aretalogus. The noun used is an interesting one. Acro in his commentary on Horace Satires 1.1,20 refers to Crispinus as philosophi cuiusdam loquacissimi nomen, qui ἀρεταλόγος dictus est. On the same line, Porphyrio says that Crispinus...cormina scripsit, sed tam garrule, ut aretalogus diceretur.² The term aretalogus became appropriate for a skilful, often long-winded, raconteur. The more incredible tales made the more successful aretalogues, and following the pattern set by Odysseus' narrative the story usually took the form of a fabulous journey. As examples of popular Reisearetalogie we may point to the romances of Alexander and the lost work of Antonius Diogenes entitled Tales of Incredible Events Beyond Thule.³

Religious "Aretalogue"?

But Philostratus really has little in common with this secular use of the term aretalogus. It seems that in its original meaning the word had a religious significance, and this is worth further consideration.

¹Cf. Dio Chrys. Or. 20.10; Scholia on Ar. Plutus 177 (Philepsius); Suet. Aug.78; Lycophron 764.

²Cf. Suet. Aug.74 (at dinner) interponebat...frequentius aretalogus.

³Photius (Bibl., cod. 166) gives a summary of this adventure story which has been variously dated between the Hellenistic Age and the second or third centuries A.D.

'Ἀρεταί, chiefly in the plural, is attested with the meaning glorious deeds (of gods or heroes), wonders, or miracles.¹

'Ἀρετα-λογία then becomes the celebration of divine ἀρεταί.

This interpretation appears in New Comedy. "Laudarier te audit libento: facio te apud illum deum: virtutes narro" (Ter. Adelphae 535).² c'

Strabo after mentioning cures at a temple of Sarapis near Alexandria continues: συγγραφοῦσι δέ τινες τὰς θεραπείας, ἄλλοι δὲ ἀρετὰς τῶν ἐνταῦθα λογίων (17.1, 17).³ Evidence of both religious and secular usages of the word from Scholia on the passage earlier cited in Juvenal (see above, p.173) is presented by Reitzenstein.⁴ He suggests a rapid development from the pious narrator of edifying exploits of the gods to the teller of incredible tales whose chief purpose was to amuse and entertain. Lucius of Patra, author of lost Transformations, which Lucian and Apuleius later adapted for comedy and entertainment, was, if Photius is to be believed, perfectly serious about his subject-matter.⁵ The form of the religious aretalogue was also adopted by Euhemerus for his philosophical treatise on the origin of the gods which was entitled Sacred Writings. If full force is to be given to the irony in this title, the existence of religious aretalogue

¹See Liddell-Scott-Jones, Lexicon, under ἀρετή and ἀρεταλογία. Cf. SIG 1172; IG 14,966; IG 2, 1426b; 1 Peter 2.9; Hom. Il. 9.189.

²Cf. Prop. 3.17,20 virtutesque tuae, Bacche, poeta ferar. s/

³In some MSS λογίων = ἀρεταλογίων, possibly through a mental slip caused by the technical term.

⁴R. Reitzenstein, op. cit., pp.8ff. (a) Arithologi sunt, ut quidam volunt, qui miras res, id est deorum virtutes loquuntur. Mihi autem videtur arithologos illos dici qui ea quae ficta <cod.=dicta> non sunt in vulgus proferunt (Schol. on Juv. palimpsestus Bobiensis). (b) Aretalogus: falsidicus, mendax, artificiosus, arete enim virtus, logos sermo Graece dicitur (Gloss in Papias, according to Du Cange). The interpretations are of (a) prophet and (b) fable-teller.

⁵Phot. cod. 129.

must be accepted before the third century B.C.

A fairly attractive theory may now be proposed for Philostratus. He was writing an aretalogue not in the popular sense but rather in the original religious sense whereby divine achievements were piously related. In so doing he has produced an effect contrary to that of Euhemerus. Whereas the latter in recounting the wonders of the gods turns them into men, the former by narrating wonders concerning a human being makes him a god. But with Philostratus too the aretalogue serves only as a framework within which something else may be presented. Other factors have now to be considered, all of which help to throw additional light on the nature of this work and prevent any satisfaction with this stage of the discussion.

Romantic elements, therefore, are undoubtedly present in Philostratus. It cannot be denied that the Life of Apollonius was in many respects a historical novel, nor that it resembled both secular and religious forms of the aretalogue. But if these descriptions are in part true, none of them is totally adequate.

Political Aspects

As one who cares for mankind, it is natural that a θεῖος ἀνὴρ is concerned about those who rule mankind. One cannot fail to see the prominence given to the role of Apollonius as counsellor of the world's rulers, especially his conflict with bad rulers.

While it is true that Apollonius's advice is predominantly about moral issues, he is seen in his relations with rulers to give advice of both moral and political nature.¹ Thus when Vardanes asked him how to govern firmly and safely, he was told to respect many but confide in few (1.37). The Babylonian king was always ready to do what Apollonius advised (1.39, cf. 31, 35, 36, 37),² and when he was ill, the sage talked to him οὕτω θεῖα that after his recovery he felt a contempt both for his kingdom and for death (1.37). Phraotes,

¹For political advice to non-rulers cf. 4.33; 5.10; 6.

²Apollonius composed the king's quarrel over frontiers with the Roman governor of Syria, and added his opinion that it was a mistake to go to war even over large issues (1.37).

the Indian king, conversed with the sage almost as an equal, and although he consulted him only once on the judgment of a law-suit (2.39), he had earlier confessed the superiority and "more kingly quality" of Apollonius's wisdom (2.27).¹ On the other hand, the king who visits the Brahmins at the same time as Apollonius is sternly rebuked for his low opinion of philosophy and of the Greek world in general (3.28-29, 31-33).

Nero and his henchman, Tigellinus, the sage opposed at Rome (4.38; 5.28), and provincial governors were encouraged to do likewise (5.10). Vespasian, conversely, seeks out Apollonius and asks for his prayers (5.27-28; cf. end of 29; end of 37). He becomes a principal adviser to the emperor and is consulted first in private and later in front of Dio and Euphrates. Moreover, Apollonius alone positively urges Vespasian to claim the throne (5.31-36). In his Apology the sage appeals to Vespasian's high regard for him and refers to a letter in which the emperor praises his pure and disinterested philosophy (8.7, ii and iii). But even Vespasian did not escape reproof when that became necessary (5.41).

Apollonius had corresponded with Titus before he became emperor (6.29) and afterwards had tendered him a mild rebuke at Tarsus (6.34). Naturally, therefore, the new emperor took the opportunity of even a brief meeting with the sage (6.30-32).

It was against Domitian that Apollonius took his most vehement stand. Books Seven and Eight are almost entirely devoted to this final conflict. The sage remonstrates openly against the emperor and spares no effort to alienate prominent Romans from the savage regime (7.5-9). Furthermore, under Domitian the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* undergoes his hardest ordeal: indicted and persecuted he is thrown into prison and brought to trial. Yet he survives. The cruellest of emperors fails to condemn him, and in leaving the court as a free man he effects the bewilderment of all Rome. Apollonius remains cool, calm, and confident throughout, and his authority does not in fact ever seem to be challenged.

¹ τὸ γὰρ βασιλικώτερον σοφία ἔχει (2.27). Cf. the Stoic phrase solus sapiens rex.

Finally, when Nerva acceded to the throne, he invited Apollonius to Rome, again soliciting his advice. This time the sage, aware of both their impending deaths, kindly refused with comforting words about the future (8.27).

The contrast between good and bad rulers can be seen at a glance. Vardanes and Phraotes, both received with great esteem (1.32; 2.25), are contrasted with the drunken fool who visits the Brahmins during Apollonius's sojourn among them. On a much larger scale, Nero's folly and Domitian's inhumanity are opposed to the wisdom and moderation of Vespasian and Titus and (less obviously) the soberness of Nerva. But this motif of political contrast is subordinate to, or perhaps contained within, a more important idea, namely the dealings of a heaven-sent θεῶν ἀνὴρ with the rulers of this world. Nowhere more clearly is this shown than in the speech of Apollonius to Vespasian, which contains an assertion, in effect, that although not of the world the sage is sufficiently in it to be concerned that the flock of mankind does not perish for want of a just and sober shepherd (5.35). Presumably Apollonius had earlier confined his attention to moral and religious reform, but was so affected by the evil of Nero's reign that from that time he was keenly interested in the persons of successive emperors.

It is difficult not to conclude that Philostratus has been at work here. Whatever the truth, it is practically inconceivable that the perfectus sapiens should not be brought into conflict with Nero and Domitian. No one can say with certainty whether these episodes were wholly or only partly worked up by the sophist. But the following observations may be noted. It is the officers of the emperor, Tigellinus and Telesinus, not Nero himself, who meet and converse with Apollonius. The account is sufficiently consistent with the historical details of the time, and although Philostratus may have used, for example, the pseudo-Lucianic Nero for some of his facts,¹ nothing was narrated of so great importance that, if false,

¹F. Solmsen, T A P A 71 (1940) pp.556ff., believes this Philostratus to be the author of the Nero and applies to it and the Heroicus the same theory. (See above, p.170 n. 1). But 5.19 appears to contain a reference to the author of this dialogue as someone other than our Philostratus. See also J. Korver, Mnemosyne, 1950, p.319ff.; M. D. Macleod, the Loeb edition of Lucian, vol. VIII pp.505-07; E. Meyer, op. cit., p.416f.

it could be repudiated from the evidence of the known facts.¹ Domitian, on the contrary, met Apollonius face to face. He suspected the sage of intrigue with Nerva and summoned him to Rome to answer an indictment. He personally persecuted and tried him, and astonishingly acquitted him. Yet outside Philostratus the only author who links together Domitian and Apollonius is Dio Cassius in his account of the vision of the emperor's assassination.² Not a word is mentioned anywhere about this unique victory of an obscure sage over the world's Dominus et Deus.

There was, then, no known encounter with Nero; the episodes with Tigellinus and Telesinus, if not genuine, may well have been introduced de rigueur. The struggle against Domitian, however, contains too much detail not either to be denied outright or to include at least a grain of historical truth. The second century could be expected to refute the contents of Books Seven and Eight if they were false. But ancient authors seem to accept most, if not all, of what Philostratus wrote. Even Eusebius does not deny that a trial took place. At all events, Philostratus must certainly have intended his contemporaries to take the biography seriously, for the prefatory chapters are irreconcilable with the standard practice among ancient novelists of neither avowing fiction nor assuring veracity. In view, therefore, of Philostratus's admission that he was writing the truth as he saw it and of the tacit acceptance of the facts by contemporary and later authors, a confrontation with Domitian, albeit of minor significance, becomes a strong possibility. The brief and contradictory nature of existing accounts will have induced Philostratus to provide the elaboration and modification indispensable to his portrait.³

¹Nero's banishment of all philosophers (4.47) is otherwise unknown and probably an exaggeration of orders to individuals.

²Dio Cass. 67.18.

³See 1.2-3. Damis' account may have served as a bare outline. 7.35 speaks of unfavourable traditions in which Apollonius grovelled before Domitian. Philostratus spared no effort to redeem the sage's reputation.

Titus and Nerva are only briefly mentioned, and neither in detail sufficient to warrant evidence elsewhere which would support or refute the part each plays in the narrative.

In view of the superstitious temperament of Vespasian, it is not unlikely that Apollonius had dealings with him at Alexandria, when both were residing in that city. Now Philostratus could not be unaware of the remarkable incidents which were alleged to have taken place, when Vespasian was in Alexandria. Yet about these famous healing miracles¹ he is absolutely silent. It is all the more surprising that he makes Vespasian visit Apollonius in a temple in order to consult him about his future (5.27ff.), when Tacitus and Suetonius relate that he visited the temple of Serapis in order to consult the god about his claim to the throne; and the miraculous appearance of Basilides in the temple convinced him that the god was in favour of his prayers. Philostratus's version would seem to be a rationalization of the miracle, which gave full credit to Apollonius.² It may be that neo-Pythagoreans, and Apollonius in particular, were unfavourably implicated in these events and that Philostratus sought to give the "true" account of the Alexandrian affair,³ according to which it was not miracles that urged on Vespasian to become emperor but discussion on kingship with a *Θεὸς ἄνθρωπος*. However, the details of the discussion may safely be ascribed to Philostratus himself. It is a self-contained controversia in the true rhetorical style giving through historical mouthpieces arguments for and against the Empire (5.31-36).

Philostratus's views on the Empire seem to be something of a compromise. He was no tyrant-hater, nor was he unconditionally in favour of a monarchy. The moderation and accessibility of the ruler is stressed: he must take advice from wise men; he must be as quick to praise as he is to punish; he must endeavour to gain men's respect rather than their fear; he must avoid any excess liable to bring shame to himself and his reign. Could it have been part of Julia Domna's commission to Philostratus that he should include within his work some sound advice for her son, the emperor Caracalla? Again, if various

¹Tac. Hist. 4.81-83; Suet. Vesp. 7; Dio Cass. 65.8.

²It is noteworthy that Tacitus (Hist. 4.83) identifies Serapis with Asclepius on account of his healings.

³Jessen, op.cit., p.23f., believed that both Apollonius and Josephus were rivals for Vespasian's favour, the one on behalf of the neo-Pythagorean movement, the other on behalf of Judaism.

scenes are intended to admonish the young emperor, there is much that could be related as a compliment to him. He was known to have encouraged the cult of Alexander and may have wished to be assimilated with the great king (Dio Cass. 77.7, 9). His enthusiasm for Heracles and Dionysus was strong, if not quite as great (Dio Cass. 78.7; 77.7). References in Philostratus to these three frequently occur.¹ There may also be no coincidence in the detailed description of a night spent at Achilles' tomb (4.11-16) and the extravagant celebration of his memory by Caracalla at the tomb in A.D. 215.²

But whatever political advice the work contained, this does not obscure the main theme. Just as romantic theories were found to be tempting but not comprehensive enough, the same is true of any political motivation. The contrast of good and bad rulers is as much a part of the rhetorical ingredients of the work as of the political ideas of its author. From the beginning, the importance and superiority of the wise man in relation to the rulers of the world is the dominant political theme. Moreover, the wise man is portrayed in the Pythagorean rather than in the Stoic tradition. Philostratus seems to be writing a critique of the long established notion of the divine emperor. He makes it perfectly clear that Apollonius is the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, which the emperors are certainly not. The divine ruler was the supreme human being. The *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* belonged to an entirely separate and elevated order of beings, neither human nor divine, but something half way between the two.

¹J. S. Phillimore, *op.cit.*, p.lxiv, refers to Caracalla's enthusiasm for Asclepius and Telephus.

²For the full report see Herodian *ab excessu divi Marci* 4.8, 3-5; cf. Dio Cass. 78.16, 7. Eventually Caracalla became a devotee of Apollonius himself (Dio Cass. 78.16; 77.8). He may have been influenced in this by his mother or by Philostratus's proposed work, but he died before the probable date of its completion (i.e. A.D. 217). The later *lararium* of Alexander Severus was undoubtedly erected under partial influence of the complete and published biography (Lampridius *Script. Mist. Aug. Alex. Sev.* 29.2; 31.4).

Apologetic: the charge of sorcery

The relation in which superhuman power and knowledge stood to magic and the practice of sorcery evidently caused Philostratus deep concern. The Life of Apollonius is almost governed by a determination to eradicate any connection between the θεῖος ἀνὴρ and a γόης or μάγος. Careful analysis shows three sorts of evidence for this apologetic tendency: one where the aim is to defend Apollonius or allow him to defend himself of the accusation, another where elements of sorcery are narrowly concealed or rationalized, and another where they are allowed unintentionally to slip out.

As has already been demonstrated, the bulk of the tradition on Apollonius apart from Philostratus depicts him as a magician.¹ It is clear from the position adopted by Philostratus that this view was an early one. At any rate, he will not have been disposed to relate various charges of wizardry, had they not been part of a very strong tradition. Yet in the Life we find that Apollonius was refused initiation at Eleusis on that account (4.18), as later he was refused entry into the cave of Trophonius at Lebadea (8.19). A similar incident is recorded in the Cretan version of his death (8.30). At Egypt he was slandered before the naked sages by a minion of Euphrates (6.7). He was warned at Rome that the emperor would attribute his premature arrival to "some mysterious power", and that people would then believe the story about the entrails of a human victim (7.12). In a personal interview Domitian confronted him with the same charge (7.34).

Philostratus begins his defence in only the second chapter of the first book. Here he ridicules the attempt (which had obviously been made in the past) to view Apollonius as a wizard because he had associated with wizards, namely the Persian magi.² The same charge, he says, cannot be applied to Empedocles, Pythagoras, Democritus or Plato, even though they all had dealings with μάγοι.³ Both Socrates

¹ See above, ch. VI, pp. 130ff.

² This, no doubt, was the view of Moeragenes. Cf. 1.3.

³ In fact both Empedocles and Pythagoras were accused of sorcery. Cf. D.L. 8.59: Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 216; Timon Silloi fr. 3. See also Pliny HN 30.2, 8.

and Anaxagoras foretold the future, but the same people who attributed to wisdom the prophecies of Anaxagoras attributed to wizardry those of Apollonius.¹ Such widespread ignorance called for a true account of the life and works of the sage (1.2).

In two important digressions Philostratus shows that Apollonius's miraculous powers had nothing to do with sorcery. It was by divine impulse (*δαίμονία κινήσει*) that he was able to make predictions, and whereas a *γόης* sought to alter the course of events by means of the black arts, Apollonius only foretold what the Fates had already ordained (5.12).² Again, after the miracle of Apollonius's release from chains in prison Damis confesses that from that moment he first understood the divine and superhuman nature of the sage; for there was no sacrifice, no prayer, no single word (of magic?) to accompany the wonder (7.38). In the following chapter Philostratus continues that less intelligent folk assign such acts to sorcerers;³ this is sheer superstition as is clear from the custom of ascribing even ordinary human actions, if successful, not to chance but to magic. Various devices of magic as used by lovers, athletes, and merchants are here humorously detailed (7.39). The aim appears to be not only to raise Apollonius above the suspicion of sorcery, but also to represent sorcery in the lowest possible light.

It is naturally important for Apollonius to be able to defend himself against the charge. Thus when his prosecutor abuses him in Aelian's presence, he replies, "If I am a *γόης* how am I brought to trial, and if I am brought to trial how can I be a *γόης*?" (7.17). Likewise his answer to Domitian's threats was, "If you believe me to be a *γόης* how can you bind me, and if you bind me how can you believe that I am a *γόης*?" (7.34, cf. 8.3).

Nowhere more effectively could Apollonius make good his defence than in the formal Apology.⁴ He refers to the charge in three different

¹For Socrates and Anaxagoras see also 8.7, ix.

²Cf. in the same ch. the words *προεγίνωσκε δὲ οὐ γοητεύων, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν οἱ θεοὶ ἔφαινον*.

³The by no means simple-minded Eusebius regarded this miracle as proof that Apollonius was a *γόης* (c. Hieroclem 35).

⁴It may be that Philostratus, in his eagerness to include a modified and improved earlier version of the speech in his own work, had overlooked difficulties which its incorporation would entail. See above, ch. VI, pp. ff.

places. Can he appeal to the gods, he asks early in the speech. They will accuse him of bringing heaven down to earth. He calls, therefore, on his friendship with Vespasian, who without asking him to perform miracles took his advice. What is more, they met publicly in a temple, not under cover by night as wizards do. Both Dio and Euphrates can testify that they talked not of sorcery but of laws and justice and the worship of the gods (8.7, ii). Later when Apollonius is defending his actions in delivering Ephesus from plague, his prosecutor insists that it was the prediction of the plague which was beyond human wisdom and possible only for a *γόνις*. The examples of Socrates and Anaxagoras again are mentioned along with that of Thales, and Apollonius protests that not even in Thessaly are wise men thought to be wizards. As for the plague, it was his own light diet that enabled him to diagnose it before it had done any noticeable harm. The gods, he says, perceive things before they happen, men when they happen, and wise men when they are about to happen. In any case, what wizard would dedicate his own achievement to a god, as he had set up a statue to Heracles the Averter (8.7, ix)? Finally, with regard to the sacrifice of a boy, not only did Apollonius abhor all forms of blood-offerings, but why, if he had foretold a plague without need of them, should he require them on other occasions! The gods, he claimed, reveal the future to holy and wise men without their being prophets or priests (8.7, x).¹

There are points in the narrative also that will belong to the apologetic. First, the general notion that Apollonius is a white magician is important. The powers he possesses are used only to promote good, never for selfish or evil purposes. Secondly, there is the persistent reiteration that his miraculous achievements are the result of a divinely inspired life pure and akin to that of the gods.

¹At 8.7, iii Apollonius ridicules the idea that he practised sorcery for no monetary gain. Cf. 4.16, where he talks to Achilles' ghost not by necromancy but "after the Indian fashion".

This emphasis on revelation can be seen in the following passages:

καὶ ἰώμεν εὐξάμενοι τοῖς θεοῖς οἷ ταῦτα φαίνουσι (1.22)
 θεὸς φαίνει σοφοῖς ἀνδράσιν (4.44)
 πάλαι προῦμαθον θεοῦ φήναντος (5.7)
 προλέγοντι δὲ καὶ ὅποσα οἱ θεοὶ περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔφαινον (5.37)
 ὡς οἱ θεὰ τούτων ἕκαστα διαλεγόμενῳ τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἀνέφαινον (8.27)
 διδόασι δὲ (οἱ θεοὶ) τοῖς μὲν φιλοσοφοῦσι διαγινώσκειν εὖ
 τὰ θεῖά τε καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπεια (2.39)
 τοιαῦτα ἐπεθείαξε προσοῶν (4.6)
 θειασμὸς (ἡ σοφία τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου - 4.40)
 φασὶ γὰρ πλείστα σε τῶν θεῶν αἰσθάνεσθαι (5.29)
 ἢ τοῦ δαιμονίου ὀμφῆ (8.7, x)

As well as his capacity for seeing into the future he also ascribed to divine intervention his miraculous journey from Rome to Dicaearchia (8.12).

The tradition is often too strong to be conveniently ignored, and careful handling of the sources is required from Philostratus.

This biographer knows nothing of talismans in the city of Antioch; indeed Apollonius finds the place far from congenial to his way of life (1.16; 3.58; 6.38). But a story is related of earthquakes on the Hellespont and an attempt by certain Egyptians and Chaldaeans to extort money from the local people for an expensive sacrifice to Earth and Poseidon. Apollonius drove them out and, divining the reason for the gods' anger, made appropriate sacrifices in each case and checked the danger at a small cost (6.41). May not this harmless episode conceal the traditions which spoke of talismans at Byzantium against all manner of natural disasters? At all events, Apollonius is allowed to recognize talismans, if he may not set up and consecrate them. In Spain he alone can declare that the Pillars of Hercules "bind together" (σύνδεσμοι) Earth and Ocean and prevent the violation of their mutual harmony. His inspiration comes from Heracles of Egypt (5.5).

Other events of a dubious nature are suppressed or watered down. Possibly concealed in the account of the selfish corn-merchants of Aspendus is the magician who writes down on a slate a curse which terrifies the villains into filling the agora with corn. The curse

has become a threat (1.15).¹ One of the questions asked of Apollonius by Titus concerned the manner of his death (6.32). Who can say whether earlier sources made the emperor consult him as if he were a *γόνος*? Philostratus evidently found the question an embarrassing one, and Apollonius needs to excuse Titus for asking it. A similar awkwardness is manifest in the description of the vampire at Corinth. The story was a famous one but, according to Philostratus, the details were not so widely known, and for that reason he has copied them at length from Damis (4.25). Vampirism was a weird belief for the superstitious. Perhaps the reputation of having denounced a lamia at Corinth earned for Apollonius the name of *γόνος*, and Philostratus's emphasis upon the story here was to correct the misdirected accounts of others. Jugglery is, no doubt, also concealed in the vague description of Apollonius's disappearance from court. At first, he simply "vanishes" (8.5), and then it is in circumstances so supernatural and unintelligible that Domitian is dumbfounded (8.8).

However, the most glaring omission of details likely to incriminate Apollonius occurs in the brief and vague account of the Babylonian magi, with whom the sage was known (1.2) to have associated. He regards it as a piece of good fortune (*εὖρημα*) that on his journey to India he would be able to visit the magi who live in Babylon and Susa (1.18). In conversation with Vardanes he explains that India is the goal of his travels, but that he never intended to pass by without visiting the king or beholding the native wisdom of the magi in order to see whether these men are, as some say, wise in divine lore (1.32). On each occasion, the fortuitous nature of the Babylonian sojourn is emphasized in comparison with the ultimate destination of the travellers, that is to say India. This becomes suspect when it is realized that the length of stay in Babylon and in India is incommensurate with the declared importance of each episode. A whole year and eight months were spent in a city only casually visited en route to India, but no more than four months passed while Apollonius resided among the Brahmins (1.22, cf. 39; 3.50). If India was considered by Philostratus to be the critical stage of Apollonius's career, in other accounts the sage

¹For similar threats cf. 6.27; 4.4; 2.4.

clearly found greater profit in the company of the magi!¹

How, then, did he pass the time in Babylon? His conversations with the king are related in detail, but these can hardly have accounted for so long a stay. Besides, even more written space is given to the conversations held in India with King Phraotes, whose customs forbade any stranger to remain in the city longer than three days (2.23). It is a safe conjecture that a considerable part of the twenty months in Babylon was spent with the magi.

The only chapter, however, to give details of the magi says, in effect, very little. "Apollonius", it begins, "has spoken sufficiently about the magi, how he associated with them partly learning and partly teaching before he went away" (1.26). But where has Apollonius spoken sufficiently about them? Clearly not in Damis' journal, for his disciple was forbidden to accompany him on his visits to the magi. Damis can tell us only that these visits took place twice daily, at midday and at midnight; and when he once asked about the magi, Apollonius replied tersely, "they are wise, but not altogether so" (1.26). This summary account is followed by the informative phrase *Ταυτὸ μὲν ὕστερον* (1.27). In fact, there is absolutely nothing "of this later on". What details Philostratus intends to pass on are those contained in that one short chapter. Conversations with the king take precedence in the narrative over interviews with the magi. Yet the end of the episode contains two extraordinary statements. Philostratus describes how Apollonius felt it time they were on their way "after he had had enough of the company of the magi" (1.39). In final conversation with the king the sage also remembers that he owes the magi and his host in Babylon a reward (*μισθός* = fee?). He asks Vardanes, therefore, to show them every kindness as they are wise and very loyal (1.40).

To return to Philostratus's cryptic statement, it may have been common knowledge that Apollonius had "spoken sufficiently" about the magi in, perhaps, his treatise on ritual or in some other work. Alternatively, Philostratus may have suppressed the details of these interviews, which he had found in Damis, because others before him had recorded them to the detriment of Apollonius. Damis' ignorance

¹Philostratus spends only one chapter on the magi (1.26) compared with forty chapters on the Indian Brahmins (3.11-50).

of the meetings described in 1.26 would then become a deliberate modification by Philostratus enabling him to disregard embarrassing details which Damis related probably without suspicion. The apparently inappropriate references in the text (1.39, 40) would belong to the original description in Damis' journal.

The reason for the omission may be seen from the introductory chapter. The charge of wizardry was by some connected with Apollonius's association with the Babylonian magi (1.2). Even if Moeragenes exaggerated this incident out of all proportion and Damis included it with cool indifference, Philostratus, who plainly was unable to repudiate the episode, found it in conflict with his interpretation of the sage's life and so was compelled to minimize its importance. The portent of the slain lioness and her eight cubs was introduced to explain the traditional duration of the stay in Babylon, which otherwise was without a good motive.¹

Finally, traces of the "lost" episode may be found in the description of a man's apartment in the royal palace (1.25). The dome-like roof was of lapis lazuli and resembled the blue sky. On it were suspended images of the gods (constellations?) and four wrynecks (the magician's bird)² which the magi themselves say they arranged. Was this an astrological temple, and was Apollonius's host, who is classed together with the magi when the sage remembers his debts (1.40), not just a "good and honourable Babylonian" but one of the king's priests?

So much for the Babylonian magi and concealment of any elements of wizardry in the Life of Apollonius. On rare occasions Philostratus decides not simply to conceal but rather to rationalize the unwanted features.

A rational explanation is attached to the legend of Apollonius's birth. It was because of his versatility and dexterity in facing difficulties and of his prescient powers that men considered him a reincarnation of Proteus (1.4). The chorus of swans does not proclaim

¹In addition to 1.22, see 1.39, where some awkwardness is felt at the long period.

²Cf. Theocritus Id. 2; Clem. Al. Strom. V.5.28, 4.

the happy birth; it causes by its din a premature delivery (1.5). The story of a "resurrection-appearance" to an unbelieving disciple is carefully narrated so that the youth sees Apollonius in a dream (8.31). The circumstances under which Apollonius raises from the dead a young girl are questioned. There may have been a spark of life left in her (4.45). There was a story that Euphrates brandished a stick against Apollonius, and most people attributed his failure actually to use it to the δεινότης¹ of the man he was about to strike (5.39). Rather than to admit a clever trick of the sage, Philostratus preferred to set this down to Euphrates' own restraint and the mastery of a fit of anger.²

But Philostratus was not so careful as to expurgate all traces of wizardry in his book. Sometimes the notion appears undisguised and obvious for all to see.

His prosecutor at Rome in Nero's time waved before Apollonius a scroll on which charges were written out. But when Tigellinus unrolled this, he found no more than a blank sheet. This convinced him, as Philostratus hastens to add, that he was dealing with a δαίμων (4.44). The story of a man who with Apollonius's help found hidden treasure in a garden need not by itself cause suspicion (6.39). But the original version may not have been so harmless if we care to look at Lucian, who calls the teacher of his false-prophet a pupil of the notorious Apollonius and a γότης "who promised...the digging up of treasure and receiving of estates" (Alex. 5.).

When Eusebius accuses Apollonius of eating the heart and liver of serpents in order to understand the language of animals, he may be stretching the point. Philostratus says only that this is how the Arabs learnt it. But the Greek is ambiguous and could mean that the same skill was picked up in the same way (1.20; Eusebius c.Hieroclem 10).³

¹ δεινότης = awe (Jessen), but more naturally for a sorcerer the meaning cleverness is appropriate here.

² Modern critics have tried to help out with the rationalization. Jessen, op. cit., p.9, thought the ἔμπουσα of 2.4 to be a baby elephant. But τετραγός is used of ghosts as well as elephants (Hom. Il. 23.101; Od. 24.5, 9). Wieland, quoted by Jessen, p. 13, suggested that in 4.10 Apollonius had originally ordered the Ephesians to drive out of their city all alien beggars and other disease-ridden vagabonds.

³ (οὐ... ἀμελήσαι) τῆς τε σοφίας, ἢ τὸν Ἀράβιον τρόπον ἐς ξύνεριν τῆς τῶν ζῴων φωνῆς ἦλθεν (1.20).

In the court-room scene (8.3) Domitian is reported to have ordered Apollonius not to bring into the tribunal any consecrated necklace (*περίακτον*), or book, or papers of any kind (containing magic spells?). The Brahmins, for whom the sage had highest respect, used to carry magic wands and wear magic rings (3.15). Indeed Iarchus, their leader, gave Apollonius seven rings named after the seven stars (i.e. planets), each of which was to be worn on the day of the week that bore its name (3.41).

Wholesale magic is practised by these Indian sages: Iarchus heals a demoniac by means of a (spell-bound) letter addressed to the evil spirit (3.38); a woman in labour is healed when a live hare is carried once around her bed and then released (3.39); the boiled eggs of an owl help to heal young men who were fatally addicted to drink (3.40). Eusebius recalls the animated tripode and bronze cup-bearers, which Apollonius praised but did not imitate (5.12), and claims that by Philostratus's own admission the Brahmins were wizards and, if Apollonius avowed himself to be their disciple, he was only bringing himself under the same imputation (*c. Hieroclem* 27, cf. 22, 38).

These, of course, are small points and have little effect on the general impression Philostratus wishes to convey. If anything, they are added out of deference to the known tastes of his reading public.

But they may be important for quite another reason. If he were inventing everything, including Damis, there would be no need to disguise, rationalize, or momentarily overlook passages which ran contrary to his professed aim of eradicating any trace of sorcery in Apollonius's life. The need to transform shows that genuine sources were being followed very closely. These sources either found the question of sorcery irrelevant, as I suspect Damis did, or set out deliberately to accentuate it out of all proportion, as is generally thought to be the case with Moeragenes. Philostratus would have us believe that his interpretation was nearer the truth. It was certainly incompatible with that of Moeragenes (1.3) and possibly a polemic in answer to it. Once again we cannot overestimate the value of Damis' journal which, regardless of its real content, Philostratus, in order to give greater authenticity to his interpretation, ostentatiously waves before the reader's eye without actually allowing him to see.

However, what was for Philostratus a problem may not have troubled the historical Apollonius. He may well have contemplated magical

experiments without being an impostor.

In his letters to Euphrates (16 and 17) Apollonius sets out his own definition of the term μάγος. The former had apparently in contempt called followers of Pythagoras and of Orpheus μάγοι. The sage replies that the followers of no matter whom ought to be called by such a name, if their intention is to be θεῖοι τε καὶ δίκαιοι (16).¹ In the other letter Apollonius asserts that the word μάγος is used by the Persians to describe men who are θεῖοι. It means, therefore, ὁ θεραπευτὴς τῶν θεῶν ἢ ὁ τὴν φύσιν θεῖος (17). If this was the original meaning of the word, confusion must have arisen out of the later association of it with the term γόγης, which is used principally in a bad sense. This will have caused Philostratus never to use either word to describe Apollonius.

With the genuine and charlatan μάγος the mystical and chemical alchemist may be compared. The mystical alchemist, however deluded he may have been, never sought the perpetration of fraud. His quest after the transmutation of baser metals into gold also entailed a spiritual transformation of himself from leaden impurity to golden perfection. The science was practised by both fools and swindlers, and earnest votaries would learn to live with the reproach of charlatan-ism. In his day Apollonius must have known that many would misinterpret his activity. In another letter (48 to Diotimus) he acknowledges two current accounts in circulation about him, and fails to show surprise at this when he considers that the same was true of Pythagoras, Orpheus, Plato, and Socrates. But with the assurance that good men will accept the truth and bad men the opposite he thinks it right for the present to say this of himself, that even the gods have spoken of him often as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ both privately to individuals and in public.

The task which faced Philostratus was not so much an enquiry after new facts about Apollonius as a fresh interpretation of facts which were at the time common knowledge. He was helped, perhaps, by the certainty that a man who had earned the reputation of a μάγος could freely be thought of by his contemporaries either as a θεῖος ἀνὴρ or as a γόγης, these two being the black and white extremes of a

¹The rewards of Pythagorean philosophy are stated in 6.11 to be the faculty of foreknowledge, the detection of gods and heroes and the ability to drive away phantoms. For a more complete list cf. Letters 52.

multiform type. The classification of Apollonius within the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, the narrow category within a more comprehensive order, depends ultimately on the interpretation of those features of his life which are common to that more comprehensive order (*μάγος*). Thus in one of the apocryphal gospels (Ps.-Mat. 31, 3) a teacher of the young Jesus confesses that "he must be either a wizard or a god". Obviously the point of view adopted would depend on the man's disposition towards the youth. For this reason Philo in rebuking certain Jews who were followers of a Greek thaumaturge attacked such men as wizards not prophets (De spec. leg. 1.319-325). Early Christians regarded their own miracles as works of God and those of pagan wonder-workers as illusions or works of the devil. In the pagan world the powerful voice of scepticism can account for difficulties against which any biographer of a holy man had to contend. Lucian in his satirical condemnation of superstition and quackery was speaking for the intellectuals of his day. Further difficulties for Philostratus were the popular notoriety of Apollonius's talismans and the damaging books of Moeragenes. He had to infuse belief into the much-maligned life of a *μάγος* not by altering the facts of his life or by placing him under an entirely different category, but by representing those same facts in such a light as to raise him higher up the graduated scale of the same category, that is to see him not as a *μάγος καὶ γόης* but as a *μάγος καὶ θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.¹

Pythagorism

The *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, then, forms a ne plus ultra on the graduated scale of the magus. The negative aspect of Philostratus's intention to remove all traces of sorcery from Apollonius is more than adequately compensated for by the very positive endeavour to place him within the other exalted category. And in choosing Pythagoras as prototype for his own conception, he goes a long way towards establishing very precisely

¹For the relationship between *μάγος* and *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* see L. Bieler, op. cit., I p.83ff. and the references there. For the magus as an all-embracing type see E. M. Butler, The Myth of the Magus (Cambridge, 1948), p.1. R. Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen (Leipzig, 1927), p. 26, commenting on the general conception of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, concludes "Im Leben ist Prophet der ehrenvolle, Goët der verächtliche Titel für sie". (Underlining mine.)

the nature of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* .

In Apollonius is personified the perfect Pythagorean life. That he was a neo-Pythagorean is apparently not good enough for Philostratus, who sees in him the neo-Pythagorean, or the new Pythagoras! The first chapter of the Life, devoted entirely to the praise of Pythagoras and his ideal, anticipates the mood of the whole work. But Philostratus claims that Apollonius practised wisdom "more divinely" than Pythagoras (1.2).¹ This, however, was not clearly recognized by all men, and so he resolved to set forth all those items *ὑφ' ὧν ἔψαυσε τοῦ δαιμόνιός τε καὶ θεῖος νομισθῆναι* (*ibid.*).

Quite apart from similarities in their lives due to the common nature of both, Apollonius is pre-eminently connected with Pythagoras. The former in his early life studied philosophy in general, but it was the teachings of Pythagoras that he grasped "by some mysterious (*ἄρρητος*) wisdom", and at the age of sixteen he answered a call to the Pythagorean life aided and abetted "by some higher (*κρείττων*) power" (1.7). This early choice is explained to the Egyptian gymnosophists (6.11, 15), and the Pythagorean life is defended before Domitian (8.7, iv). At Babylon, home of the magi, he declares his wisdom to be that of Pythagoras (1.32). His vegetarian diet, his discipline, his clothes are those of Pythagoras (1.8; 7.15 et passim). He uses the rites of Pythagoras and Empedocles to purify a man who had shed blood (6.5). He is pleased to find the Brahmins spiritual brothers of the Master (3.13, 19). He descends the cave of Trophonius "for the sake of philosophy" and emerges with a book containing the tenets of Pythagoras; a volume thoroughly in keeping with his enquiry, for he had asked the god what he considered to be the most perfect and pure philosophy (8.19). In Letter 52 Apollonius lists for Euphrates the blessings to be gained from the Pythagorean life. In all, twenty-seven boons are named.

Other incidents of a more precise nature connect Pythagoras and Apollonius. Not only did Apollonius himself observe a period of five years' silence, but he also imposed a similar period of four years for

¹Cf. 1.13, where Apollonius goes further than Pythagoras. Not content with remaining faithful to one wife, he shunned women altogether. For slander of Apollonius totally rejected by Philostratus see VS 2.5.

his pupils before communicating his rites to them (1.14 and 16). His bi-location at Smyrna and Ephesus is compared explicitly to Pythagoras' simultaneous appearances at Thurii (sic) and Metapontum (4.10). The desire to visit Mt. Ida in Crete is explained by Pythagoras' descent of the Idaean cave along with Epimenides (4.34). His secret knowledge of the real meaning of Milo's statue at Olympia is appropriate for a Pythagorean, as the burning of Milo's house is a prominent feature in the traditions on Pythagoras' death (4.28). The "mysterious journey" which was to take Apollonius to Rome (7.10) reminded his disciples of the pilgrimage of Abaris (who travelled over the earth on an arrow). More importantly, the friendship of Pythagoras and Abaris, which was a comparatively early tradition, and the popular view of the latter also as a holy man would be recalled by ancient readers. It is, perhaps, to be expected that Apollonius should recognize in a tame lion the soul of Amasis and then, as it were, pay back the favours which the Egyptian is said to have bestowed on Pythagoras in his country (5.42).

This together with the recognition of Telephus's soul in a mad dog (6.42) recalls the recognition by Pythagoras of a friend's soul in the yelping of a dog and, of course, his capacity for understanding and talking to animals.

Two important circumstances about the life of Apollonius, both of which serve to connect him with Pythagoras, may have wider implications for Apollonius alone. The first of these is the journey to India and initiation into its wisdom; the second is the esoteric quality about Apollonius's discipline and teachings.

For Pythagoras extensive travels were clearly part of the early tradition. But importance is assigned only to Egypt, and India enters the list at a later stage;¹ it may have been added as a result of the journey of the new Pythagoras. Nowhere does Philostratus link Pythagoras with India; it is his contention rather that Indian wisdom was transmitted to him in Egypt by ancestors of the gymnosophists of Book Six, prior to the degeneration of their thought (6.11; cf. 8.7, iv). The close resemblance between Pythagorean doctrines and Indo-Aryan thought² is not necessarily explained by direct contact. "Like

¹See above, ch. II.

²For Pythagoreanism and Indian thought see F. C. Baur, op. cit., pp. 201-16; G.R.S. Mead, op.cit., pp. 18ff. See also below, p.194 n.2.

conditions will produce similar phenomena; like efforts and inspiration will produce similar ideas, similar experience, and similar response."¹ But the strong tradition of travels in the East at a time when no one possessed adequate knowledge on which to base a comparison of Indian and Greek thought does make some form of contact likely. Brahmins were notoriously recluse, but disciples of Pythagoras could easily have talked in Egypt to missionaries of Buddhism, the one Indian religion certainly propagated abroad. At all events, these ideas were indispensable to Philostratus, who saw Apollonius as bringing renewed from the East the wisdom of early Pythagoreanism. If the Egypt visited by Pythagoras was no longer a centre of the purest and highest form of wisdom (cf. 6.11), it would be necessary for the new Pythagoras to journey to the source and origin of that wisdom, which was India.

But the Indian journey is also seen for Apollonius as the critical stage in his career: it is the period during which the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is initiated in superhuman wisdom and prepared for his mission in the world. He begins the journey as a young man (1.18) and approaches the Brahmins as a learner (3.12, 13, cf. 16, 50). However, on leaving the sages he is recognized by them as an equal, and Iarchus declares that men will consider him a god in his own lifetime (3.50). He has achieved absolute wisdom; he now ceases to learn and begins himself to teach. Nevertheless, when he embarks upon his missionary activity it is the Pythagorean, not the Indian, that we see. There is nothing oriental about his activities or teachings which is not at the same time appropriate to a Pythagorist. The recognized connection between Indian and Pythagorean thought would supply Apollonius with a motive for his eastern travels.² Whatever he learnt in India, so far from contradicting his way of life, served only to deepen his understanding of Pythagoras' wisdom.

The esoteric nature of Apollonius's teachings and discipline also recalls the early Pythagorists, whose doctrines were handed down only to initiates. This secrecy is further suggested by phrases used to

¹G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p.23.

²Philostratus shows that Apollonius understands this connection when in 6.15 the sage calls Nilus "an enthusiastic lover of the doctrines of the Indians and of Pythagoras".

describe his wisdom: τῆς ἀληθινῆς σοφίας(1.2), τῆ σοφίᾳ τῆ σῆ (2.38), σοφίας τῆς ἐμῆς (6.17), τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας (4.12).

In the Apology he asks Domitian to question him privately about the causes of disease, as they are too abstruse (σοφώτεροι) to be divulged to ordinary men (8.7, ix). Examples illustrative of this knowledge of secret things hidden from the rest of mankind have been cited in a previous chapter.¹ The mysterious force which first impelled Apollonius to follow Pythagoras has already been noted (1.7).² Moreover, in his preliminary initiation period in the temple of Asclepius at Aegae he acknowledges the secret (ἄρρητος) wisdom of the god of healing (1.11).

It is noteworthy that Damis is often left in the dark concerning Apollonius's plans (7.10, 13; 8.28). He is excluded from interviews (1.26; 3.12, 41; 5.10, 29; 6.32). Many of the important events are reported by Damis only from what Apollonius later told him (3.27). He also misunderstood much of what Apollonius said. The mystical sayings of Apollonius about "Brahmins living on earth and yet not on earth, walled without walls, and possessing nothing but everything" (3.15) are taken literally by Damis to refer to levitation and other magical powers. But in 6.11 Philostratus quoting from an address to the Egyptians (see again 3.15) makes Apollonius claim to have spoken thus in riddles after the Pythagorean fashion. Damis evidently was no Pythagorean disciple—he was not required to follow Apollonius's example of abstinence from flesh and wine (2.7). But if not fully initiated into his wisdom, he was nevertheless the closest companion. He alone of all the others is eventually admitted to the Indian mysteries (3.34). It is, however, only to marvel, not to understand (cf. 3.36, 43). Moreover, Apollonius would be careful not to reveal for the journal secrets which ought to be heard only by the initiated few. Philostratus, who displays little interest in serious philosophical doctrine, would, to be sure, discover few traces of it in Damis. For this the modern reader has to consult the one fragment preserved by Eusebius from Apollonius's treatise On Sacrifices.³ This together with a few hints to be gleaned from Philostratus, in

¹See above, ch. V, pp. 106ff.

²See above, p. 192.

³Eusebius Praep. Evang. 4.13.

particular the emphasis on purity in personal discipline and in public rites, denote a rejuvenated Pythagorist way of life suitably adapted to meet syncretic and oriental requirements of the times.

A final question needs to be asked. Did Philostratus consciously choose to model his portrait of Apollonius on the legendary life of Pythagoras, and if he did what were his reasons? The significance of the Pythagorean traditions before and after Philostratus has already been assessed.¹ It should be remembered again that there is no evidence of any fully comprehensive Life of Pythagoras before those of the later neo-Platonists. Early legends there were of miracles and powers, but the details were scattered and lacked any cohesion or order. Nor was there any serious interpretation of the whole life of Pythagoras within the concept of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. The detached elements contained only the germ of what later was to become a full-blooded biographical treatment. In Philostratus's day Pythagoras was no more than a semi-historical figure of the dim and distant past and of little interest to the people at large.

Apollonius of Tyana, on the other hand, belonged to fairly recent times and, as the examination of sources has shown, was a well-known figure of the first century, either worshipped or detested by men of varying dispositions. But Apollonius was also a Pythagorean. Was the connection between the two, therefore, due only to the fact that the historical Apollonius lived his life in strict conformity to the pattern of his spiritual forefather? Certainly Philostratus was less interested in Pythagoras than Apollonius, who was for him the more important *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* (1.2). However, this does not without difficulty explain his introductory chapter, which without mentioning Apollonius sets up Pythagoras as a man who communicated with the gods and was called by his friends *ἐκ Διὸς ἤκοντα* (1.1). To give Pythagoras so prominent a position in the Life of Apollonius must surely mean that in Pythagoras lies the clue to Philostratus's own interpretation of Apollonius.

This becomes most reasonable if it is recollected that Philostratus's greatest problem was to remove from his subject all traces of sorcery. He would not need reminding of the general perplexity surrounding

¹See above, ch. II, pp. 26f., 38ff.

Pythagoras' nature, so concisely expressed by the Aristotelian epigram:

Τὸ μὲν ἔστι θεός, τὸ δ' ἄνθρωπος, τὸ δὲ οἶον Πυθαγόρας (Fr. 192 Rose).

Were the Greeks ever sure what to make of Pythagoras? Did he not typify many μάγοι, genuine or fraudulent, on whom over the years it had become prudent to suspend judgment? Was not a similar ambiguity to be observed about the life of Empedocles (also mentioned in 1.1), of Lucian's Peregrinus and Alexander? Philostratus, who saw the resemblance between Pythagoras, prototype of the equivocal μάγοι category, and Apollonius, its latest representative, believed that he was now in a stronger position to make more emphatic assertions about the higher class of μάγοι. His book reverberates with the message that at the top of the scale the supreme μάγοι was none other than the Aristotelian "Pythagoras-man", the truly godlike man of which Apollonius was now clearly the most identifiable embodiment, in that he lived not centuries ago but in comparatively modern times. He is no charlatan, much less a dabbler in the black arts--the goēs at the bottom of the magos scale. His nature is that neither of god (θεός) nor man (ἄνθρωπος) but of a species half-way between the two; and if this species owed its initial rise to Pythagoras (τὸ δὲ οἶον Πυθαγόρας) it found in Apollonius its final confirmation.

Polemic against Christianity

It could easily be maintained that quite sufficient motivation has now been ascribed to Philostratus for his biography. But the category to which Apollonius belonged was not confined to Pythagoreans nor even to the Graeco-Roman world. The Pythagorean θεῖος ἀνὴρ is only the pagan nomenclature for a concept attested more universally in the period of the early Empire, clear evidence of which is provided in the remaining two chapters. To what extent this influenced Philostratus is by no means certain. But one serious claim made in the ancient world needs to be taken up here.

It was the work of Hierocles (c. A.D. 305), a provincial governor under Diocletian, that guaranteed for the Life of Apollonius in the third and fourth centuries treatment with a seriousness and importance in religious discussion which its author could hardly have imagined,

far less intended.¹ His pamphlet to the Christians pseudonymously entitled Lover of Truth (Φιλαλήθης) drew a parallel between the lives of Apollonius and Christ. We know of its existence only because it raised issues which Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea and Church Father (c. A.D. 260-340), felt bound to answer. It is the reply, the contra Hieroclem, that has survived.² From it may be seen the general principles of his attack on Christianity. It was in part the same argument which had previously been voiced by Celsus; indeed Eusebius refers his readers to Origen for the answer to it.

But Hierocles was the first to cite specifically Apollonius of Tyana as rival to Christ in the pagan world.³ He sought to show that the miracles recorded of Apollonius were better attested than those of Christ and that the Christians could not therefore lay exclusive claim to miracles as proof of divinity. This was a fairly spirited attack: to deny the miracles of Apollonius was to deny the same of Christ, whereas to accept the miracles of Christ necessitated acceptance of the miracles of Apollonius. The importance of the miraculous element in Christian writings was thereby greatly reduced.⁴ The reply of Eusebius also was not lacking in vigour. He concluded a thorough, if understandably one-sided, criticism by reaching a position which destroyed all historical basis for the miraculous in Apollonius or

¹For Hierocles see CIL III 133 (= III 1661): Lactantius Div. Inst. 5.4, 2; 5.2, 12. According to Lactantius, the pamphlet was addressed to the Christians, not against them (i.e. the role of adviser not persecutor adopted). Hierocles' apparent familiarity with the Scriptures led Lactantius to believe that he was a former Christian. It must be noted that the Apollonius-Christ parallel is the one argument out of many that Eusebius chose to answer in detail. Others were contradictions in the Scriptures and criticism of the apostles. See further in P. de Labriolle, La Réaction Païenne (Paris, 1948), pp. 303ff.; M. Meunier, Apollonius de Tyane ou le séjour d'un dieu parmi les hommes (Paris, 1936), p. 18; F. C. Baur, op. cit., pp. 1ff.

²This tract is conveniently included in vol. II of the Loeb edition of the Life of Apollonius.

³Eusebius c. Hieroclem 1.

⁴Hierocles "endeavoured to reduce the importance of the miracles of Christ without denying their existence and wished to show that Apollonius had performed equal and greater ones" (Lactant. Div. Inst. 5.2, 12).

assigned this to the work of evil demons.¹

However, Eusebius seems only to have taken the smarting sting out of a wound which never wholly healed up. The views of the ancients were almost entirely determined by their sympathy for the new Christianity or the old paganism.² A highly inflammatory history of orthodox opinion on Apollonius can be traced from Eusebius down to modern times. Besides the Church Fathers, pagan philosophers, and early Christian monastics--whose views have been related in the previous chapter--almost every cleric who wrote seems to have held views on this subject: Philostratus becomes the devil incarnate contriving to supplant Christ by a counterfeit of his own.³

The Aldus edition of Philostratus (1501) also appended Eusebius's reply to Hierocles so that "the antidote might accompany the poison". Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494) denounced Apollonius as a loathsome magician who had made a pact with the devil.⁴ Meric Casaubon (1599-1671) thought it was not Satan but the same spirit with whom John Dee had had dealings.⁵ In his Explication de l'Apocalypse (Paris, 1669, p. 276) Boussuet sees Apollonius as the third beast of the Revelation.⁶ Another French theologian, l'Abbe Frepel, believes him to be part of Satan's last stand against Christianity (Les Apologues Chrétiens au deuxième siècle, n.d., p. 106).⁷ L. de Tillemont in his

¹See especially c. Hieroclem 31. Even Origen did not deny that there were miracles at the shrine of Antinous in Egypt (c. Celsus 3.36) or at temples of Asclepius and Apollo (ibid. 3.25 - 5.7, 3), but in each case they were due to demons and assisted by magic. For the same charge applied by Celsus to Christ see ibid. 1.68; cf. 1.6; 1.38.

²See above, p. 134.

³See in particular G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., pp. 42ff; A. Reville, Apollonius of Tyana the Pagan Christ of the Third Century (London, 1866), pp. 56ff; M. Meunier, op. cit., pp. 20-21; F. W. Groves Campbell Apollonius of Tyana: a Study of his Life and Times, with an Introduction by Ernest Oldmeadow (London, 1908) pp. 12-16.

⁴G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p. 42; A. Reville, op. cit., p. 57.

⁵E. W. Groves Campbell, op. cit., p. 14.

⁶M. Meunier, op. cit., p. 21.

⁷Ibid.

Histoires des Empereurs (Paris, 1720, p. 200) describes him as an offspring of the devil deliberately born at the same time as Christ in order to hinder His work.¹ Others simply regarded the details as fabulous and without foundation. A tract by the so-called Phileleutherus Helvetius (Duaci, 1734) classes together as spurious the miracles of Pythagoras, Apollonius, St. Francis, St. Dominic, St. Ignatius of Loyola, and determines those of Christ only as authentic.² A more extreme view was to deny the very existence of Apollonius altogether. Thus Daniel Huetius, bishop of Avranches, claimed that the purpose of Philostratus was to disparage the then powerful faith and doctrine of Christ by inventing a figure in imitation of Christ and adapting all the many incidents in Christ's life to the account of Apollonius "so that the pagans could have no reason to envy the Christians".³

At the same time opponents of the Church, similarly uncritical and partisan, renewed the attack of Hierocles. In 1680 Charles Blount published notes in English on the first two books of Philostratus. He saw the miracles of Christ and Apollonius as being equally apocryphal or equally true. Preparations for the remaining books of the work were soon cut short when after a public outcry the volumes already in circulation were condemned. In 1779, however, Blount's notes were translated into French by Castillon and appended to his version of Philostratus, which was ironically dedicated to Pope Clement XIV and fancifully signed "Philalethes".⁴ Both Francis Bacon and Voltaire spoke favourably of Apollonius, but the latter was sceptical of the

¹J. Jessen, op. cit., p. 3.

²F. C. Baur, op. cit., p. 14. See Helvetius p. 3.3... Philostratum denique centonem illum a Damide relictum in ordinem digessisse, exornasse, atque ex odio christianae religionis data opera pleraque confinxisse. Kayser, editor of the Teubner edition (1st ed. Zurich, 1844, 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1870), regarded the contents of Philostratus's Life as fictional. G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p. 44, quotes as typical of many titles L'histoire d'Apollone de Tyane convaincue de Fausseté et d'Imposture (Paris, 1705), by l'Abbé Dupin.

³Huetius Demonstratio Evangelica Propos. IX. 147, p. 674: Itaque ad Christi exemplar hanc expressit effigiem et pleraque ex Christi Jesu historia Apollonio accommodavit, ne quid Ethnici Christianis invidere possent. See F. C. Baur, op. cit., p. 14; A. Reville, op. cit., p. 58.

⁴A. Reville, op. cit., p. 58f.; G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p. 45f.

miracles of both him and Christ.¹ These attacks naturally met with countless refutations all of which agreed that Philostratus wrote in a spirit decidedly hostile to Christianity.²

Such, then, was the effect of Hierocles' pamphlet and Eusebius's answer to it. It should be noted, however, that in the ancient controversy nothing is said about the intentions of Philostratus. We are informed by Eusebius (c. Hieroclem 1) that of all hostile Christian writers Hierocles alone collated the lives of Apollonius and Christ. This ought to have ruled out Philostratus at an early stage in the history of the polemic. It is often asserted that few today would hold the view that Philostratus intended his Life of Apollonius to be a pagan counterblast to the Christian gospel.³ Indeed the position in its extreme is clearly untenable for two reasons. First, there is a complete absence of positive evidence for any polemical tendency of the sort used by Hierocles. Nowhere in Philostratus is to be found any reference to the Christian Church, to Christ himself, to his apostles, or to the gospels.⁴ Negative admissions can by themselves never prove anything. However, one cannot but feel that if Philostratus had intended to deal a blow to the early Christians, he might have done it more convincingly.⁵

A second and stronger reason for the rejection of any polemical tendency in Philostratus's work is that in his day, the period of the Severi, Christianity posed no real threat to the pagan religions of the Empire. It was not yet strong enough to present any serious

¹M. Meunier, op. cit., p. 21 n.1; A. Reville, op. cit., p. 59; P. J. B. Legrand d'Aussy, Vie d'Apollonius de Tyane (Paris, 1807 2 vols.) II p. 314, cited by G. R. S. Mead, op. cit., p. 45.

²See above, p. 199 n.3.

³E.g. F. C. Conybeare in the Loeb translation (London, 1912), p. xv; G. W. Bowersock in the introduction to the Penguin translation (by C. P. Jones, 1970), p. 21; A. H. Armstrong in Man, Myth and Magic: an illustrated encyclopaedia of the supernatural (published by Purnell, 7 vols.), I p. 109.

⁴A solitary reference to the Jews in 5.33 as a race "in revolt against all mankind" expresses a view held widely by Romans (cf. Tac. Ann. 15.44; Hist. 5.2-5) and is not relevant to the discussion.

⁵Cf. E. Berwick, The Life of Apollonius of Tyana Translated from the Greek of Philostratus with Notes and Illustrations (London, 1809), p. 219.

challenge. After the early persecutions of the first century there followed a period of laissez-faire in which new religions were generally allowed to exist side by side with the old faiths on the understanding that none should encroach upon the ground of the other. Things were different in Hierocles' time. There may have been a danger then of the Christian religion carrying all before it. It was soon to be recognized by a Roman emperor. This would appear to be a more suitable occasion for the union of all pagan religions to oppose the newcomer. It is, therefore, unnecessary to read back too far what was essentially a fourth-century movement. Philostratus had no need of a champion for a paganism that was anything but dying.¹

F. C. Baur in Germany (1832) and A. Reville in Holland (1866) believed that the anti-Christian polemic maintained by Hierocles could in some part be read back to Philostratus. Their argument is that Philostratus was not so much afraid of Christianity, nor indeed hostile to it--how could he be under the Severi?--but rather envious of it.² He sought to make Apollonius a pagan rival to Christ and his apostles not in order to replace but to stand alongside them as one whom pagans could more readily accept.³

Baur quotes the statement by Olearius of the accepted view:

Statuunt viri eruditi scopum sive Juliae sive Philostrato sive utrique propositum eum fuisse ut Christo Apollonium opponerent eiusque philosophiam ac mores illius doctrinae et institutis:...⁴

If opponerent here signifies only "set in comparison with", all that is being avowed is the parallel drawn between the lives of Apollonius and Christ. A motive for the comparison was all too readily supplied

¹Even when Celsus wrote (c. A.D. 178-80) it was from personal hostility to rather than fear of Christianity.

²Cf. Huetius ne quid Ethnici Christianis invidere possent (see above, p.200 n.3).

³A. Reville, op. cit., especially p. 68; F. C. Baur, op. cit. It is surprising that scholars persist in attributing to F. C. Baur the view that Philostratus's work was an anti-Christian polemic. Baur only admits a deliberate parallel between the lives of Apollonius and Christ; hostile intentions are never conceded. See his pp. 101-04, 120-30, especially p. 128.

⁴F. C. Baur, op. cit., p. 101, quoting from Olearius Praef. to the Vit. Ap. p. xxxix.

by others. It is clear, however, that if Philostratus did consciously draw this parallel, admiration makes more sense as a motive than malevolence. Reville speaks of a genuine attempt in the third century to christianize the old pagan creeds so that they could compete more equitably with their younger rival.¹ Philostratus's Life of Apollonius was seen as an attempt to furnish paganism with a Christ-like figure. In this the sophist displayed greater foresight than either Porphyry or Iamblichus, who later chose for a similar purpose Pythagoras, a personality too far removed from the events, institutions and ideas of the period.²

So Apollonius is to become the champion of a dying paganism; what is more, a reformed paganism in which the advantages and superiority possessed over it by Christianity--in particular the personification of the supreme religious ideal in a perfectly holy and spiritual human life--are to be turned to its own good.³ If ever a counterpart was needed for Christ, Philostratus's Pythagorean idealisation of Apollonius was best suited for the role. But again it should be remembered that both Baur and Reville saw Apollonius not as a hostile rival, but as a friendly facsimile designed to stand alongside of Christ under the tolerant and syncretistic propensity of the times. In other words, Philostratus liked what he had discovered of Christianity, he saw only the best in it, and sought to make its noble sentiments and high ideals a possession also of the pagan world by means of the perfection personified in Apollonius.⁴

This theory of friendly rivalry can explain more easily than one of anti-Christian propaganda the difficulty of Philostratus's silence concerning the rival religion. He could never hope to destroy

¹A. Reville, op. cit., pp. 2, 3, 92.

²Ibid., p. 89; cf. Philostratus's own words in 1.2.

³Cf. A. Reville, op. cit., p. 3, "the old religion, foreseeing its imminent decline, conceived the idea of prolonging its days by the adoption of those outward trappings and outward forms which belonged properly to its younger rival".

⁴F. C. Baur, op. cit., pp. 130-38, compares the contrary attitude of Lucian in the Peregrinus, where Christianity is considered to be a fanaticism of the time. According to Baur, self-induced martyrdom was the extravaganza under attack, and the satire is as much directed against the Christians as against Peregrinus.

Christianity without referring to it either by name or implication. Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles and other powerful opponents of the Christians used the direct form of attack. If Philostratus, however, hoped to utilize some of the ideas expressed in the new religion, if Apollonius was to be in paganism what the Christians saw in Christ, any specific reference to Christianity would immediately render the whole work a transparent imitation. Consequently, the silence of Philostratus would be anything but an indication of indifference. The parallel would be presented in such a way as to create the impression that it was independent of Christianity, or that the author was unaware of its existence. Deliberate ignorance gives the appearance of impartiality.

It is by no means certain that Philostratus did allow himself to be influenced by the movement of Christianity, and even if Apollonius was to be in the pagan world a counterpart to Christ, the model on which his portrait was based was certainly not Christ but, as we have seen, Pythagoras. Nevertheless, no one can seriously expect Philostratus to be unacquainted with Christian literature. The close proximity in which both Apollonius lived to Christ and Philostratus to the early Christian writers makes it no less probable that Philostratus had heard about Jesus than that the Christians had heard about Apollonius. Besides, among emperors under whom the sophist lived, in a private lararium Alexander Severus worshipped with others Apollonius, Christ, Abraham and Orpheus.¹ Before him Caracalla was reared by a Christian nurse.² And Septimius Severus seems on the whole to have been favourably disposed towards Christianity; his law punishing conversion and proselytism contained a mollification of earlier legislation: the different religions were to stand side by side, each to its own sphere.

¹Lampridius Script. Hist. Aug. Alex. Sev. 29; cf. 43, where the emperor plans a shrine for Jesus but is stopped by an augur who foretold as its consequence the conversion of the world to Christianity and the ruin of all other temples. The Gnostic Carpocrates worshipped images of Homer, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Christ and St. Paul (Irenaeus Haer. 1.23, 6; Augustine Haer. 7); see E. R. Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety (Cambridge, 1965), p. 107. Julia Mamae, mother of Alexander, held interviews with Origen, in which she was told much about Christianity (Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 6.21).

²Tertullian Ad Scapulam 4.

without hindrance or suppression on the part of another.¹ Furthermore, in view of some of the striking parallels which may be drawn between episodes in Philostratus and in the canonical and apocryphal gospels and acts it seems reasonable to suppose that on one side or another borrowing of material was possible. The process can be exaggerated, but it should not altogether be dismissed.²

If details which belonged specifically to the lives of other men also suited appropriate situations in Apollonius's career, there would be no ancient scruple to forbid the adoption of these. As it is almost certain that Philostratus will have known about Christ, it is to be expected that he will have recognized him no less than Apollonius as a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* and will have been attracted by the content of details in the life of Christ. From whatever appealed to him in this narrative it would be quite feasible to make minor insertions into the Life of Apollonius. But there is no evidence that interest in Christianity went further. The point of contact is not in the significance of the Christian message but only in the kind of stories related of the Christian thaumaturge.

Similarly the writers of apocryphal acts reshaped the lives of their favourite apostles with features from the personality and deeds of Jesus. It would be ludicrous to suggest any attempt on their part to rival Christ! They were simply telling the stories of *θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι* in accordance with what, as we shall see, has become a new genre of popular literature. It is this genre of which Philostratus was partly conscious when he turned to biography. It is neither biography nor hagiography, but an extension of the former and the precursor of the latter: "theiography", the biography of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.

It has been the purpose of this chapter to show how the portrayal of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* was by far the most important motivation behind the Life of Apollonius and that other considerations, though present in the work, were subordinated to this one aim. The remaining chapters will investigate the nature and extent of the genre of popular literature on the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* in the first two centuries A.D.

¹ Spartian Script. His. Aug. Sept. Sev. 17. Eusebius, none the less, assigns to Septimus a persecution (Hist. Eccl. 4.1).

² On the details of the parallel lives of Apollonius and Christ see below, ch. IX, pp. 266ff.

CHAPTER VIII

NEAR AND LATER CONTEMPORARIES OF PHILOSTRATUS

Philostratus's Life of Apollonius is the best and fullest account, in so far as we can judge, of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* in Greek or Roman literature. In writing this detailed biography in accordance with the fund of ideas that was readily available in his era he has made a major contribution to our understanding of the concept of god-man in the ancient world. The degree to which other writers of the same age were familiar with this common fund is now to be given examination. In addition to the political and philosophical notions of wise man and king did writers of the first two centuries A.D. know of popular tradition which eagerly incorporated stories, whether oral or written, of *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* ?

We may look in three directions. First, there is Lucian of Samosata (b. c. A.D. 120) who wrote in the second half of the second century and probably died before its close. A fierce critic of chicanery and credulity, Lucian ought to provide information pertinent to this study. Secondly, two Jewish writers of renown, Philo (c. 30 B.C. - A.D. 45) and Josephus (b. A.D. 37/8), wrote and adapted for Greek readers respectively the philosophy and the history of Judaism. All available Greek ideas will have been used in order to translate from one culture to the other. Finally in this chapter account will be taken of later biographical traditions where in the third century the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* appears in Lives of Pythagoras, Plato, Plotinus and others; and in the fourth century St. Athanasius's Life of St. Antony prepares a way for the complete Christianization of the pagan concept in hagiography.

Lucian

Lucian's general attitude to the deification of men and the anthropomorphism of gods is naturally one of scepticism and ridicule.¹ Ruler-worship is particularly assailed,² even more so when a king's favourite is placed in heaven.³ But Lucian was also aware that divine honours were regularly paid to private individuals. The sympathetically portrayed Timon is anything but flattered when his friends promise to set up a golden statue of him beside Athene on the Acropolis.⁴ Empedocles, who disappeared under mysterious circumstances, is given by Lucian the benefit of no doubt: he is a complete fraud; he is denied access to the Isles of the Blessed, he is burnt to a cinder, and on being mistaken by Menippus for a lunar demon dispels the latter's consternation with the words: οὐτὶς τοι θεὸς εἶμι, τί μ' ἀθανάτοισιν εἴσκει; ⁵

In certain cases, however, qualified acceptance is given of divine honours paid to men. Lucian admits its political usefulness to Alexander;⁶ and sanctity of life entitles Demonax to be worshipped at Athens and Athenodorus at Tarsus.⁷ In all other respects the very idea is sacriligious!⁸

A more detailed examination will be made of three works:

The Death of Peregrinus, Alexander or the False Prophet, and Demonax.

¹See J. Tondriau, "L'avis de Lucien sur la divinisation des humaines", Museum Helveticum 5 (1948), pp. 124-32.

²Cf. Hist. conscr. 12; Conc. D. 12; Dial. Mort. 12.2-3; 13.1-4.

³Hephaestion and Alexander are cited (De Calumnia 17-18; cf. Conc. D. 2ff) but Lucian was probably thinking of Hadrian and Antinous, a pair no less renowned and almost contemporary (cf. Cass. Dio 69.11).

⁴Timon 51.

⁵Icaromenippus 13: a parody of Fr. 112 l.4.

⁶Dial. Mort. 13.1; 14.1.

⁷Demonax 1, 10, 63, 67; Longaevi 21.

⁸Conc. D. 12; Dial. Mort. 3.1; see further J. Tondriau, op. cit., p. 126.

E. R. Dodds classes Peregrinus and Alexander of Abonuteichos together with Aelius Aristides as examples of "daemonic personalities" in the ancient world, who correspond to the *πνευματικοί* of the New Testament, the spirit mediums of our own time, and the so-called god-boxes among the Polynesians.¹ This is the prophetic, ecstatic type: the person subject to attacks of dissociation during which superhuman perception is experienced. To the Graeco-Roman world it was known conventionally as *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. Misrepresentation of this type either through ignorance or envy will be as inevitable as fraudulent impersonation.

Peregrinus Proteus

The portrait of Peregrinus (d. A.D. 165) may be understood more clearly if it is remembered that he was a Cynic, a member of the vagabond brethren so utterly detested by Lucian. Not that all Cynics were impostors: Dio Chrysostom spent part of his life as a vagrant missionary; Demetrius, because he practised what he preached, was worshipped by Seneca as a moral teacher of the highest integrity; Demonax received genuine praise from Lucian himself.² But ancient writers readily attest the startling proportion of charlatans among the Cynic philosophers;³ none more so than Lucian, to whom they are vulgar and ignorant men taking advantage of the profound respect which the average person usually shows towards philosophers.⁴ The Cynics whom Lucian delineates were for the most part impostors--bearded hobos complete with dirty clothes, stick, purse, and a knack for living off the rich. In the Sale of Lives they are offered at two obols apiece!

Peregrinus is selected by Lucian as an example of Cynic dissemblance and subjected to a merciless and thoroughly hostile attack. It is futile to ask whether Peregrinus was only a fraud or a true *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. What attracts immediate attention, however, is the

¹E. R. Dodds, Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 53, 60f. Wrongly Dodds ignores as "fictitious romance" the Life of Apollonius of Tyana.

²Dio Chrys. Or. 78; Seneca Ep. 20.9; Ben. 7.11; cf. 7.8, 2; Tacitus Ann. 16.34; Lucian Dem. passim.

³Dio Chrys. Or. 32.9; Epictetus 3.22, 80.

⁴Lucian Fugitivi 3-4, 16; Vit. Auct. 8-12.

ambiguity of his character. It was so extraordinary as to cause doubts in men's minds.

Lucian believed the act of self-immolation by Peregrinus to be a conscious display, all for the love of glory: Empedocles tried at least to "carbonify himself" in secret, whereas Peregrinus chose for his fiery departure the Olympic Festival (ch. 1, cf. 21).¹ Theagenes, on the other hand, a disciple of the Cynic, boldly declared that it was more than vainglory that prompted Peregrinus to follow in the illustrious steps of Heracles, Asclepius, and Dionysus, as well as Empedocles (ch. 4).² He even expected his master at the pyre to leave mankind for the gods (ch. 6). Then a bystander, who can be only Lucian himself, took the platform and gave the case against Peregrinus. It has been suggested that this work of Lucian was the reply to an earlier laudatio funebris of Theagenes.³ When it is considered that Theagenes is said later to have compared Peregrinus to the Brahmins (ch. 25) but that in Lucian's version of his speech there is no mention of these men, the probability of an earlier independent eulogy becomes a real one. The fact that soon after his death he became the object of a cult may also have urged Lucian to write.⁴ At all events, the real intention of Lucian is concealed behind a misleading title, *Περὶ τῆς Περεγρίνου τελευτῆς*. It was not so much an account of his death as of his whole life in order to depict him as a rogue.⁵

¹Thirst for glory may be a sufficient driving force for this act of suicide. See A. D. Nock, Conversion (Oxford, 1933), p. 201. Cf. Lucian Peregrinus 22.

²Historical precedents are Calanus at Suza in Alexander's presence (Plut. Alex. 67; Cic. Div. 1.23, 47; Tusc. Disp. 2.22, 52; Strabo 15.1, 64), Zarmarus at Athens in front of Augustus (Cass. Dio 54.9; Strabo 15.1, 73). See also R. Pack "The Volatization of Peregrinus Proteus" Amer. Journ. of Philol. 67 (1946) p. 334. Other Cynics who committed suicide were Diogenes (D.L. 6.2, 76), Metrocles (ibid. 6.95), Menippus (ibid. 6.100), and Demonax (Lucian Dem. 65).

³J. Bernays, Lukian und die Kyniker (Berlin, 1879), cited by R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, pp. 37f.

⁴A bronze statue set up in his honour at Parium (birthplace of Peregrinus) was said to have performed miracles. See Athenagoras Leg. pro Christ. 26. and cf. Lucian's prediction in ch. 41. See also E. R. Dodds, op. cit.; p. 60.

⁵See J. Schwartz, Lucien de Samosate: Philopseudes et De Morte Peregrini (Paris, 1963), p. 62.

.In his indictment of Peregrinus's early career no concrete evidence is given by Lucian to prove the alleged immorality (chs. 9-10). It is the usual gossip and malicious rumour that gathers about the life of one who endeavours to raise himself above the accepted norm.

After being driven out of his own country under the charge of patricide, Peregrinus's travels took him to Palestine, where his reputation with the Christians is certainly exaggerated. His apparent importance goes unmentioned in Christian literature: Eusebius knows of him only as a Cynic philosopher who burnt himself alive at Olympia.¹ But his relationship with Christians need not be fiction. A genuine pneumatic man would find acceptance in Christian communities, and we may expect that Peregrinus was not without some qualities to have found a place as *προφήτης* (ch. 11).²

Lucian says that he took advantage of simple Christian folk who were open to the most ludicrous doctrines without requiring evidence of their validity (ch. 13). He became their prophet, cult-leader, head of their synagogue, and interpreter of their books with the result that they praised him as a god, treated him as lawgiver, and made him their leader "second only to the one whom they revere even to this day" (ch. 11). Like all good Christians, Peregrinus was thrown into prison and visited daily by the faithful, some of whom, unable to obtain his release, bribed the guards at least to let them spend the night with him. They would call him *καλὸς Σωκράτης* (ch. 12). Eventually, after some repugnant relapse into Cynicism the Christians disowned him (ch. 16).

When he returned home, he silenced those who still suspected him of having murdered his father by declaring his inheritance public property—a feature commonly found in the lives of holy men (chs. 14-15). But Lucian convicts him of roguery by making him attempt later to claim back his property (ch. 16). Subsequently Peregrinus continued his travels and visited Egypt, where he was

¹For an explanation of Eusebius's silence see G. Bagnani, "Peregrinus Proteus and the Christians", *Historia* 4 (1955), p. 111.

²Rules given by the author of the *Didache* (? before A.D. 100) for the hospitality of wandering prophets confirm that many impostors were abusing these rights. (*Didache* 11-13; cf. 1 Jn. 4.1).

instructed in ascetic practices (ch. 17). Here he met Agathoboulos, who had also taught Demonax (cf. *Demonax* ch. 3). In Italy he was expelled on account of his frankness, a fate shared with every Cynic worthy of the name (ch. 18).¹ He advised the Greeks to make war against Rome and rebuked various people for various reasons.²

It was, however, when his reputation began to wane, and for the want of some new marvel with which to astound people thus causing them to stare at him, that he made his final promise. Suicide may have been more appropriate to Stoicism than to Cynicism, but men like Peregrinus are not easily assigned to any one category.³ His alleged purpose in dying was to teach men contempt for death (ch. 23)—an ideal he will certainly have learnt if he came into contact with Christians. Lucian, whose caustic humour is discernible at various stages in the work, laments the fact that his followers did not emulate him (ch. 24, cf. 30).

Peregrinus now seems to possess a remarkable oracular faculty: at one time he tells of dreams in which Zeus was forbidding him to pollute a sacred place (i.e. Olympia), at another time he cites oracles to the effect that he is to become a *δαίμων νεκτοφύλαξ*, and he foresees the altars and golden images of his apotheosis (chs. 26-27). Lucian "foresees" how simpletons will soon swear that Peregrinus had healed them of fevers and that they had seen his *δαίμων* in the dark; that an oracular shrine would be set up to be maintained by his own college of priests, and perhaps a nocturnal mystery (*τελετή*) at the site of the pyre (ch. 28). Theagenes also had quoted a sibylline oracle foretelling all these things (ch. 29). With probable hindsight Lucian was simply exaggerating what in part really took place soon after the event.

On the appointed day it is Heracles that Peregrinus chooses to impersonate; Lucian pictures him with wallet, cloak, and club (ch. 36). After incense is sprinkled onto the fire, he stands facing the south, which, according to Lucian, was all part of the show. With the words

.....
¹Lucian mentions Dio, Epictetus and Musonius. Cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 13 (Demetrius).

²Travels, outspoken advice, and rebukes were part of the routine of Apollonius of Tyana.

³On Cynics who committed suicide see above, p.209 n. 2.

"Spirits of my mother and father, receive me kindly", he leapt into the flames.¹

For the benefit of gullible people who craved for knowledge of the facts Lucian adds to these details. He claims personally to have invented the report of an earthquake and a vulture which soared aloft from the midst of the flames (ch. 39). Later he met with a pious old man who himself vouched for the vulture as well as claimed to have seen Proteus, as he called him, after the cremation "clothed in white" and to have left him walking about in the Portico of the Seven Voices wearing a garland of wild olive (ch. 40). For the general picture the appearance of Romulus to Julius Proculus may be recalled.² But Lucian's claim of invention (ch. 39) may not be worth much. The words spoken by the metamorphic vulture strangely recall the heavenly voice that greeted the "ascension" of Apollonius of Tyana.

Lucian Peregr. 39 ἔλιπον γὰρ, βαίνω δ' ἐς Ὀλυμπον.
Philostr. VA 8. 30 στείχε γὰρ, στείχε ἐς οὐρανόν, στείχε.

The Doric dialect, for which there is no clear reason in either passage, suggests that both Philostratus and Lucian were using a similar source and transferring from it to their own works the idea of an ascension.³

From further references to Peregrinus in the Fugitives we may gather that controversy persisted after his cremation. In this dialogue, written soon after the Peregrinus, it is related how the Olympians

¹ These last words were perhaps in mockery of Christian martyrs. F. C. Baur, Apollonius von Tyana und Christus, pp. 130ff., believed Lucian's aim was to generalize in Peregrinus one of the great aberrations of his age, the fanatical glorification of martyrdom. Lucian published this work soon after Peregrinus's death (A.D. 165) in the reign of M. Aurelius, when many a Christian will have died in persecutions. For a similar view of martyrdom see M. Aurelius Meditations 11.3; Pausanias 6.8, 4.

² Plutarch Rom. 28; cf. Cicero Rep. 2.10, 20; Leg. 1.1, 3; Livy 1.16, 5-8. At the same time, one cannot fail to see resemblances here to the stories of Jesus' resurrection in the New Testament, which may have been common knowledge in Lucian's day.

³ I. Lévy thought that the original story was told of Pythagoras and that Doric was used because it was a chorus of the Muses that greeted him. See his Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore, p. 139, and La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine, pp. 73-75.

learnt of the event as a result of the dreadful stench caused by roasted flesh (Fugitivi ch. 1). Philosophy herself knew nothing about it and was not even there when it happened (ch. 7). These uncomfortable references to Peregrinus in what was probably the very next dialogue must be due to extravagant claims which Lucian saw the Cynics making about their new saint.

However, if Lucian never relented in exposing Peregrinus as a fraud, there were others who thought differently. Against his interpretation may be set the view of Aulus Gellius, who as a student at Athens often visited this virum gravem et constantem;¹ and Ammianus Marcellinus, who on the occasion of the burning of one Simonides, at Valens' command, eulogized Peregrinus the philosophus clarus.² Besides, the actions of Peregrinus were always open to equivocal interpretation, and Lucian does reveal much that would lead us to infer that to some, at least, Peregrinus was a man of extraordinary dimensions.

Alexander of Abonuteichos

The only external evidence to corroborate a cult of Peregrinus is provided by the passage already referred to (p.209 n. 4) in Athenagoras. With regard to the more famous Alexander of Abonuteichos (religious activity c. A.D. 150-170) inscriptional evidence attests a cult for both the prophet and his serpent;¹ the name Glycon accompanies the image of a serpent with a human or an animal head on coins of

¹Aulus Gellius NA 12.11; cf. 6.3. Gellius says that Peregrinus spoke on the text "Time the all-seeing, all-hearing lays bare every secret" (Sophocles Fr. 301 Pearson). In view of this, E. R. Dodds, op. cit., p. 62, proposes as motive for suicide a guilty conscience on account of Peregrinus's patricide and compares his last words, "spirits of my mother and father, receive me kindly" (ch. 36).

²Ammianus Marcellinus 29.1, 39.

³See A. D. Nock, "Alexander of Abonuteichos" CQ 22 (1928), pp. 160ff.; M. Caster, Etudes sur Alexandre ou le faux prophète (Paris, 1938), pp. 94-96. The inscriptions are as follows: Iovi Iunoni et draconi et draccenae et Alexandre Epitynchanus C. Furi Octaviani c(larissimi) v(iri) posuit—CIL III 8238; Glyconi M. Ant. Onesas iusso dei l.p.—CIL III 1021; G(ly)co M. Aur. Theodotus iusso dei p.—CIL III 1022.

Pontus and Paphlagonia;¹ the representation of a snake with animal head is found also engraved on precious stones.²

It has been suggested that the Peregrinus was a polemic in reply to an encomium of Theagenes. A similar motive may well lie hidden behind the Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ ψευδόμαντις. Lucian calls Alexander a false prophet, which could mean that others had regarded him as a true one. The work was written after A.D. 180 for a friend, Celsus, some ten years after Alexander's death.³ This interval of ten years, lacking for Peregrinus, proved of importance for Alexander. Legend had given him a notoriety which was so controversial that a friend was induced to demand from Lucian an accurate account of his life (ch. 1).

The Alexander is in the form of a βίος (ch. 1), though it resembles more closely the branch of literature which describes the πράξεις⁴ or achievements of a famous person. Here, however, the remarkable feature is that elements normally associated with the concept of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ are used not to adore but to deride the ψευδόμαντις. From the beginning, two points emerge: Lucian was aware how a θεῖος ἀνὴρ, genuine or otherwise, was conceived in the popular eye; and the extraordinary characteristics of the μάγος do not of themselves set him apart as either θεῖος ἀνὴρ or γόης, but produce contrasting effects in different people. Lucian's aim is to show all Alexander's deeds as mere affectation, and for every incident that apparently exhibits superhuman power to reveal a natural, and often contemptible, explanation.

¹A. D. Nock, op. cit., p. 160 n. 6; M. Caster, op. cit., pp. 96ff., where the coins are also illustrated. See also A. M. Harmon in the Loeb translation of Lucian vol. IV p. 251; B. V. Head, Historia Nummorum p. 432.

²M. Caster, op. cit., p. 98. See also his Plates H and I.

³For the date of ch. 48 and the reference to M. Aurelius as a "god". On the identity of Celsus see M. Caster op. cit., pp. 1-5, where he concludes that it is not the recipient of Origen's apologetic. In fact there is no chronological difficulty. The famous Celsus is thought to have written c. A.D. 178-80. Origen accepted the identity (c. Celsum 1.8; 1.68), and we may well imagine the staunch opponent of Christianity seeking from all quarters evidence of similar deceptions.

⁴πράξεις is used in ch. 1 (Alexander the Great) and ch. 2 (Alexander the false prophet).

The convictions of Celsus are not known, but Lucian's position is immediately clarified. He is to write about a γόης¹ who is as steeped in villainy as Alexander of Macedon was imbued with heroism. Indeed, he fails to understand his friend's request for the exploits of a detestable rogue (ἄνδρα τρισκατάρκτον ch. 2) to be set down permanently in writing. What he actually offers is his own satirical version of the ἀρεταλογία which not a few admirers of Alexander could wish to see earnestly attempted. Many features belonging to the portrait of a θεῖος ἀνὴρ are employed, but only to reinforce the general picture, which is a parody of that concept. Where stock features are not explained away they are exaggerated out of all proportion. In short, what the True History did for tall stories of travel and adventure (secular aretalogie), the Alexander did for popular belief in the idea of a θεῖος ἀνὴρ (religious aretalogie).²

In outward appearance Alexander could equal any θεῖος ἀνὴρ. He was tall, handsome, and truly θεοπρεπής; the bright gleam of his eyes was both terrifying and inspiring, his speech was most pleasing and distinct, and in this respect no fault could be found with him (ch. 3). His mind was likewise endowed; he had a superabundance of intelligence, wit, memory and the natural aptitude for study (ch. 4). However, he made the worst possible use of these talents and became the most competent rascal the world has ever known.³ Once when speaking of himself "with all modesty" Alexander compared himself to Pythagoras. But, adds Lucian, with all due reverence to Pythagoras,⁴

¹In Conc. D. 12 Lucian makes a regrettable reference to the plague of oracle-mongers (called γόητες) who in his day were throwing Apollo out of business.

²R. Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 38, classed this work as a Ἀληθῆς Ἱστορία. I. Lévy, Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore, p. 1139, called it (wrongly) "un calque systématique de Pythagore". F. C. Baur, op. cit., pp. 117-120, saw both Apollonius and Alexander as μάγοι, each being depicted in a different light by his biographer: for Philostratus Apollonius was a divine man; for Lucian Alexander was an unparalleled swindler. But these pictures were two extremes from which much has to be removed if the true facts, which both exceed, are to be known. Lucian, Baur says, would have done the same for Apollonius had not Alexander proved a better example.

³Lucian mentions Alexander's beauty, intelligence, etc. not to show impartiality but simply because without these the success of the oracle was not easy to explain. See M. Caster, op. cit., p. 89.

⁴The words in the text (ἔλωτ' μὲν ὁ Πυθαγόρας εἶη) are a common formula used especially of the respect due to a god. For Lucian's view of Pythagoras see above, ch. II p. 39.

a sage of wondrous intelligence, if he had lived in Alexander's time he would have seemed a child by comparison (ch. 4). There follows a terse pen-picture of Alexander's distinctive qualities: lying, trickery, perjury, malice, and the like.

Leaving the more general aspects of his character and personality, Lucian embarks upon the details of Alexander's career. The young *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* was invariably handsome and, therefore, open to corruption. Alexander, unlike Apollonius who at Aegae warded off improper suggestions (VAL.12), sold his favours to those who required them (ch. 5, cf. 41). One *διδάσκαλος καὶ ἐραστής* was none other than a Tyanean, whom Lucian directly associated with Apollonius as someone "well acquainted with the pomp and ceremony of that man's life" (ch. 5).¹ The connection with Apollonius is natural, for in Lucian's mind he and Alexander were of the same type. Both were controversial and ambiguous figures in their day.

When the Tyanean died, Alexander fell in with a Byzantine writer of choral poetry, and together they toured the country *γοητεύοντες καὶ μαγγανεύοντες* (ch. 6). In the company and at the expense of a rich middle-aged Macedonian woman they travelled to Pella. Here they bought a tame serpent of the kind (says the rationalist Lucian) which probably slept with Olympias, mother of King Alexander (ch. 7). Both decided that there was money in oracles and prepared to set up a prophetic shrine. Paphlagonia was selected as a base since its inhabitants were stupid, superstitious, and rich; and they greeted every class of fortune-teller with wonder as if each were *ἐπουράνιος* (chs. 8-9). So much for Lucian's assessment of any charismatic traditions on Alexander in Paphlagonia!²

Without delay bronze tablets were buried at Chalcedon. These, which were to be casually discovered, would disclose that Asclepius and his father Apollo were soon to take up residence in Abonuteichos. As it happened, the accomplice died of a serpent-bite (ch. 10), so that father Apollo had to remain in heaven. But the discovery of the tablets had already led to the building of a temple, and Alexander,

¹This hostile tradition on Apollonius, which Lucian clearly knew, was most probably the one represented by Moeragenes.

²See N. Caster, *op. cit.*, p. 16 for Lucianic comment on human credulity, and pp. 17-19 for the character of the Paphlagonians in literature.

whose hair was now long and in ringlets, made a showy entrance in Empedoclean style wearing a gaudy costume and carrying the scimitar of Perseus, from whom he claimed descent on his mother's side (ch. 11). To support this claim he cited an oracle which called him *θεός Ἀλέξανδρος*. As if this were not enough, a Sibylline oracle had been "discovered" which spelt out in numbers the first four letters of his name (ch. 11).¹ Lucian, of course, thinks all this very amusing. He pictures the credulity of the duped Paphlagonians who accepted Alexander's divine descent, though they knew full well that his parents were poor, humble folk. But this is the perennial paradox of the nature of a *θεός ἀνὴρ*! The humour continues as Lucian explains that the fits of madness and foaming at the mouth, which accompanied the prophet's spectacular arrival, were contrived by the chewing of soapwort. Nonetheless, to his countrymen even the froth seemed "fearful and divine" (ch. 12).

The ingenious method of establishing the cult of the "new Asclepius" (ch. 43)—the baby serpent concealed in a goose's egg and temporarily hidden in the mud near the site of the new temple, the mumbo-jumbo of the prophet and the discovery of the egg, the epiphany of the god in a dark room in the form of the fully-grown Macedonian serpent wearing a human-headed mask (chs. 12-16)—if not the invention of Lucian,² is the supreme achievement of artful cunning. The people are positively wonder-struck; the size of the serpent (after only a few days), the tameness, the human head, seemed to them a *τεράστιον* (ch. 16). The news, suitably enhanced by those who told the story, spread so that from Bithynia, Galatia, and Thrace people came flocking in to see the prodigy. Soon paintings, statues, and cult-images were made of the new god, now named *Γλύκων* in accordance with a divine command (ch. 18).

Alexander's main line of business was to be in giving oracles, and so the day was announced when the god should make prophecies (ch. 19).³

¹The oracle contained the Greek numbers 1, 30, 5, 60 in that order (= α λ ε ξ in letters). And to remove all uncertainty the last line began α ν δ ρ ο σ α λ ε ξ η τ ῆ ρ ο σ κ α λ (ch. 11).

²Lucian cannot help but admire this scheme. He says that in order to expose Alexander it needed someone who, though apparently taken in, would refuse to believe what he thought he saw. There was no such man among the Paphlagonians (ch. 17).

³The *μάντις* may be a traditional type in Asia Minor. The shrine of Amphilochus at Mallua (ch. 19) was famous. Cf. Strabo 14.5, 6; and for other shrines Philostratus *VA* 4.1; Tacitus *Ann.* 2.54. See also A. D. Nock, *CJ* 22, p. 161

The price for an oracle of one drachma and two obols may not have been much, but Lucian says that in one year the prophet made often seventy or eighty thousand drachmas (ch. 23). Much of this will have been spent on overhead costs, for he had to pay assistants, interpreters, and propagandists, and later his own secret service in Rome which fed him the information vital to many of his responses (chs. 24, 30, 36, 37, 51). The prospectus of the oracle noised abroad by assistants included predictions, the discovery of runaway slaves, thieves and hidden treasure, healings, and sometimes the raising of the dead (ch. 24). Throughout the Roman Empire warnings were issued of plagues, fires, and earthquakes; each warning was accompanied with a promise of infallible assistance against it (ch. 36).¹

The shrine clearly enjoyed considerable success. Lucian, however, was convinced that it was trickery. He explains how the sealed scrolls were undone without damage, the question answered after a fashion, and the seals closed again (ch. 20).² Presumably, the miracle of a written answer on sealed paper was more astonishing than the content of the answer! When the demand became abnormally heavy, Alexander gave "nocturnal" responses. This method did not require the seals to be opened (a rather lengthy process); instead, Alexander heard the god's answers in his dreams, appended these as obscurely as he possibly could to the scrolls and exacted large fees from interpreters whom he allowed to offer their services to the recipients (ch. 49). On rare occasions, only to the rich or noble, the serpent-god delivered oracles in person without the prophet. The tubular device whereby this ventriloquism was performed is unfolded by Lucian (ch. 26).

One of these "autophonous" oracles encouraged the governor of Cappadocia, Severianus, to invade Armenia. When this proved disastrous, all traces of the oracle were removed from the records and it was replaced by another discouraging such a campaign (ch. 27). A "Delphic" prediction of victory (cf. Hdt. 1.53) was given to M. Aurelius in his wars against the Germans (ch. 48). In fact Alexander was always ready with a recantation in the case of lame prophecies (ch. 28). Furthermore, if he found any question rather venturesome, he made no reply and withheld

¹One such oracle was given during the plague of A.D. 165. But those who wrote up the *ἀλεξιφάρμακον* over their doorways were by some strange chance nearly always the very households affected (ch. 36).

²For the method used cf. Hippolytus *Hæer.* 4.34.

the scroll for purposes of blackmail (ch. 32). Finally, as if to complete his indictment, Lucian affirms that oracles were given often to people who had never asked for them or maybe who did not exist (chs. 50, 52).

Clearly Lucian cannot deny the highly respectable clientele of the shrine. He may have intended to dupp only the Paphlagonians, but his success, fraudulent or not, was so widespread that even emperors consulted him. Among the more prominent Roman customers was P. Mummius Sisenna Rutilianus,¹ whose religious life is humorously described in detail (ch. 30).

Not content with fame as a prophet, Alexander inaugurated an annual celebration of mysteries in honour of Asclepius, Glycon, and himself (chs. 38-40). The three-day festival began with a proclamation forbidding Christians and Epicureans (both atheists---cf. ch. 25) to draw near, and ended in a torchlight ceremony.² In the course of the rites Alexander sometimes displayed a golden thigh (ch. 40), which Lucian says was only gilded leather. This caused two "learned simplotons" to discuss whether or not he was a reincarnation of Pythagoras. Glycon provided the answer with an enigmatic response to the effect that Pythagoras' soul was sprung from Zeus and to Zeus it would return!³

It was an Epicurean who first tried to expose Alexander. The man was stoned and barely escaped with his life (chs. 44-45). But the prophet was genuinely afraid of Epicureanism: its philosophy of ἀταραξία could ruin the business of his shrine (chs. 25, 47). Lucian's own attempt to convict him met with greater success. He tells with the fervour of a campaigning journalist how he set traps for Alexander by giving false information on the nature of the supposed questions contained in his sealed scroll (ch. 53); how publicly instead of kissing the prophet's hand he took a bite out of it, and later in privacy allowed him to strike up a deal of friendship; and how a plot on his own life misfired (chs. 53-56). Lucian was now

¹Proconsul A.D. 172. See M. Caster, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-56.

²On the first day the birth of Asclepius was celebrated, on the second the epiphany of Glycon, and on the third Alexander's birth.

³For the Pythagorean interpretation of this oracle see M. Caster, *op. cit.*, pp. 64ff. and I. Lévy, Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore, p. 141.

ready to prosecute openly but was deterred (conveniently?) by Avitus, governor of Bithynia and Pontus (cons. A.D. 144; procons. 156, 165). The governor's excuse was his goodwill towards Rutilianus, but he was probably more afraid of Alexander's influence in his province (ch. 57).

Lucian undoubtedly exaggerated the sensational side to Alexander's career. An ironic aura of sanctity surrounded his promiscuous living: husbands actually swore that their wives had borne his children (ch. 41). It is considered absolute impertinence when he asks the emperor to change Abonuteichos into Ionopolis,¹ and to strike a new coin bearing on one side Glycon's image and on the other that of himself wearing the chaplet of Asclepius and carrying the scimitar of Perseus (ch. 58). But it is plain from inscriptional evidence that some of these demands were granted. He predicted that he would live to be one hundred and fifty years old. In fact, says Lucian, he died at the age of seventy not, as promised, by a stroke of lightning, but from gangrene in his leg (ch. 59). Lavish funeral games were held in his honour and a contest took place to decide upon a successor. Rutilianus, the judge, found neither candidate worthy of the office (ch. 60).

The savageness of this attack corresponds to the intense anger of the author. Lucian could not brook the credulity of his day. As far as he was concerned, the superstitions of those times could never become the scientific fact of tomorrow. He abhorred even more all forms of fraud. If to some the actions of Alexander were open to interpretation, there was no doubt in his mind. For Lucian the *μάγος* was always a *γόης*. His attitude will be more clearly understood if we consider the homage paid to Epicurus in the final chapter. He had earlier hinted that no one armed with the philosophy of Epicurus could fear the supernatural (ch. 47). His sole purpose in writing was to defend the memory of Epicurus, "a man whose nature really was *ἱερός* and *θεοπέποιτος*, and who alone with the help of truth perceived *τὰ καλὰ*" (ch. 61). This is Lucian's critique of the popular conception of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. He is saying that only men like Epicurus are truly divine, for they are the genuine liberators of all who seek their company (ch. 61).

¹See W. Caster's explanation of the word *Ionopolis* (*op. cit.*, pp. 72f.).

Lucian's angry distortion demonstrates the ambiguity of this paranormal type. It may be that the hostile Apollonian tradition of Moeragenes had set the pattern for his shorter pamphlet. But, as far as we know, there was no Philostratus to redeem Alexander's reputation. Whether this means that he did not deserve rehabilitation is a question which invites no confident answer.¹ Perhaps A. D. Nock hits the mark when he asks, "If we cannot estimate the exact measure of honesty in the leaders of certain movements in our times, how can we judge precisely how far Alexander of Abonuteichos was charlatan and how far by his own light prophet?"² Apollonius, Peregrinus, and Alexander are all evidence for the concept of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Controversy has been seen to surround both Peregrinus and Apollonius. Now if Alexander was so successful that a cult survived him by nearly one hundred years, Lucian's opinion of him as a false prophet is at face-value only the conventional view of scepticism. It may be more appropriate to ask the question when did the charlatantry take over in the case of this *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

Demonax

After Epicurus it could be said that Lucian admires Demonax of Athens (2nd century A.D.). In attempting to write about him Lucian the satirist shows that he is not unable to recognize good qualities in some men.³ He mentions together Demonax and Sostratus as men worthy to be remembered for their great physical and intellectual strength (ch. 1). Sostratus, apparently the first pagan hermit, he had spoken about elsewhere.⁴ The life of Demonax was now to be told first in order to preserve his name and secondly that young men

¹M. Caster, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-102. Caster says that in uniting his lot with an oracle Alexander *a priori* looks like an impostor (p. 101). But, as he also admits, although fraud and intrigue were often perpetrated at oracular shrines, there is rightly more tolerance now for psychic phenomena as a result of important studies (e.g. by M. Cumont) of Eastern religion in the Empire.

The connection with Pythagoras, whom Lucian does not always ridicule, may help to explain Alexander's obsession with sanctity.

²A. D. Nock, *Conversion*, p. 270.

³On the unusual seriousness of Lucian here see Eunapius *VS* 454.

⁴The work (or reference) is not extant. For Sostratus see Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* 4.1, 1; and E. R. Dodds, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

may have a modern pattern of the good life instead of having recourse to ancient precedents for their behaviour (ch. 2).

Now Lucian will hardly be able to use the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* for Demonax if by means of the same category he brought ridicule upon Alexander. No truly supernatural powers are, therefore, related of him, nor any mysterious or inspirational teachings, nor any claim to divinity. Nevertheless, the recognition of holiness by his contemporaries is attested, and the course of his life in several respects follows the traditional pattern for a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. A brief glance at this vignette gives one to understand that Lucian, had he been so disposed, could have produced a biography of Philostratean dimension, if not in length, certainly in loftiness of tone. This was not his inclination, as we learn from the closing sentence: "These things are only a few out of many, and from them it is possible to imagine what sort of man he was." (ch. 67).

Born in Cyprus of not undistinguished stock, Demonax soon aspired to philosophy. He was set on this path not by his four illustrious teachers but "in early childhood (was) aroused by a natural desire for moral excellence (*τὰ καλά*) and an inborn love of wisdom" (ch. 3). Although he was a Cynic, he did not, like the baser brethren, draw attention to himself by eating special food or wearing different clothes from other men (ch. 5).

Lucian compares him throughout to Socrates, of whom he is a spiritual disciple (chs. 5, 6, 11, 58, 62). The Eleans' offer of a bronze statue at Olympia was refused lest it reflect on their ancestors, who had not accorded such an honour to either Socrates or Diogenes (ch. 58). When asked whom among the philosophers he liked, he replied, "I worship (*σέβω*) Socrates, admire Diogenes, love Aristippus" (ch. 62). At Athens he had his Anytus and Meletus who brought against him charges similar to those with which Socrates had been accused, namely his refusal to perform sacrifices and his singular avoidance of the Eleusinian Mysteries. He made his defence in the Assembly. On the first count he claimed that Athens did not need his sacrifices,¹ on the second he said that he had refused to be initiated because of the rule of silence: if the mysteries were worthless he would dissuade

¹Cf. Apollonius of Tyana's Letters 26.

others from participating, if they were good his love of mankind would compel him to reveal them to all the world (ch. 11). Even though he had begun his speech by taunting the Athenians with the murder of his beloved paragon, its effect was astonishing. The citizens, dropping the stones which were already in their hands, began to honour, revere, and finally wonder at him.

The life of Demonax was a benefaction on the human race. He valued friendship as greatest of mortal possessions and was distressed only at the illness or death of a friend (ch. 10). He reminded rich and poor alike of the transitoriness of human life. He made it his business to reconcile family quarrels, and on a more public scale he had calmed even disturbances of the people (ch. 9). Once by simply appearing in the Assembly he quelled all party strife, and then left without speaking a word (ch. 64).¹ The character of his philosophy was described as *πρᾶτος καὶ ἡμέρος καὶ φαιδρός* (ch. 10). He was never excitable nor angry when rebuking others. He attacked only the sins and pardoned the sinners, taking as his example the physician, who healed sickness without feeling anger towards his patients. Evidently he looked upon his life as a divine mission, for, as Lucian admits, he thought it characteristic of a man to make mistakes, but the part of a god or a godlike man (*ἀνδρὸς ἰσοθέου*) to help those who have stumbled (ch. 7).

A vast list of witty replies (chs. 12-62) interrupts the main biographical account. These were essential to the text and no doubt included as examples in the ancient world of repartee. The apophthegm was to become a permanent feature in biographies of eminent philosophers, for a man's philosophy of life could easily be contained in a number of pithy maxims.¹ Many of the sayings of Apollonius were transformed into letters and thus preserved in various collections. In general, among the ancients the epigrammatic sentence seems to have won for its author praise and admiration everywhere.

¹Cf. Philostratus VA 1.15.

²Cf. D. L. 6 (Life of Diogenes the Cynic) and the "symbols" of Pythagoras.

³Cf. the Letters of Apollonius of Tyana preserved in Stobaeus Florilegium.

Demonax was more revered than admired. Lucian goes so far as to say that at Athens both the leading citizens and the ordinary people viewed him as a superior being (τινα τῶν κρείττωνων ch. 11). And he was so loved throughout Greece that civic dignitaries rose up in his presence and everyone was silent when he passed by (ch. 63).

But it is towards the end of his life that Demonax becomes more discernibly a θεῖος ἀνὴρ. When very old he would eat and sleep uninvited in the nearest house, and the occupants regarded the incident as the epiphany of a god and believed that an ἀγαθὸς δαίμων had come into their home (ch. 63). In the streets bread-women would endeavour to offer him food, thinking themselves lucky if he accepted; children offered him fruit and called him father (ch. 64). He lived to be almost one hundred years old in perfect health and happiness, being an encumbrance to no one, of service to his friends, and without an enemy in the world (ch. 63). When he was no longer able to wait on himself, he died cheerfully of voluntary starvation (ch. 65).¹

No pretentious burial was desired by the man who even in death sought to be of service to dogs and birds (ch. 66). But the Athenians gave him a public funeral and went into mourning for a long time. Everyone attended and the philosophers acted as pallbearers. Honours normally associated with a shrine were conferred even upon the stone bench where Demonax used to sit (ch. 67).²

On the surface Lucian's Demonax appears to be no more than a collection of apophthegms within the framework of a βίος. A remarkable feature of the work, however, is the respectful tone from beginning to end. Lucian had recognized in Demonax alone the true philosophical life, which perhaps amounted to nothing more than unworldliness. From his reverent portrait we may assume an acquaintance with the popular conception of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ. The ludicrous caricature of this in Peregrinus and Alexander demonstrates that it was conscious awareness on Lucian's part.³ However, the question of

¹According to one tradition, this was the end of Pythagoras (D.L. 8.40).

²καὶ τὸν θάκον τὸν λίθινον... προσεκύουσι καὶ ἔστεφάνουσι ἐς τιμὴν τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἡγούμενοι ἱερὸν εἶναι καὶ τὸν λίθον, ἐφ' οὗ ἐκαθέζετο (ch. 67).

³Lucian's knowledge of the category extends to other dialogues. In Nigrinus 38 an account of that philosopher is said to be σεμνὰ καὶ θαυμάσια καὶ θεῖα γε κτλ. In the Cynicus (ps.-Lucian?) Heracles, the Cynic ideal, is called τὸν πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἄριστον, θεῖον δὲ ἄνδρα καὶ θεὸν ὀρθῶς νομισθέντα. See in general H. D. Betz, Lucian von Samosata und das Neue Testament (Berlin, 1961), pp. 100-143.

a literary prototype in his day is still debatable. We are dealing only with isolated features of the category and it is not certain if at any time before Philostratus these features had been assembled into a comprehensive biography of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

Philo and Josephus

The faintness of the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* in Lucian is partly due to his lack of interest in religious ideas. An agnostic who neither knew nor cared about things divine, he spent a lifetime exposing deceivers and mocking those deceived. This was certainly not true of two hellenized Jews, Philo and Josephus, who in their distinctive ways made available to the Greek and Roman world the culture of Judaism.

Josephus was a historian, and he was sympathetic to Rome.¹ His account of the Jewish War, published under Vespasian, was intended to present to the Jews the invincible power of Rome. In the Jewish Antiquities, written under Domitian in different circumstances, he sought to demonstrate that the history of his people was in every respect a match for that of the Roman race.² Philo, on the other hand, was a philosopher who had fully imbibed the wisdom of Plato. He was concerned not to popularize the facts, but rather to prove the worth and depth of Hebrew Scriptures. If Josephus on a superficial level believed that Abraham taught the Egyptians what they imparted to the Greeks,³ Philo with greater profundity believed that all human wisdom was contained implicitly in divine revelation.

¹After the fall of Jotapata in A.D. 67 his life had been saved by Vespasian, who he predicted would become emperor (BJ 3.392-408; cf. Suet. Vesp. 5; Cass. Dio 66.1). There were few at the time who could have been unaware of Vespasian's superstitious nature. Cf. the predictions of Apollonius (Philostr. VA 5.30).

²It is believed by some that Josephus modelled his Jewish Antiquities on the similar Roman work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The title (*Ἀρχαιολογία*) and the number of books (twenty) are identical, and as Dionysius sees Romulus, Josephus sees Moses as legislator of his people. But Josephus, where he is not original, is an industrious compiler and copyist of several earlier works. See F. J. Foakes-Jackson, Josephus and the Jews (London, 1930), p. 259.

³AJ 1.168; cf. Eusebius Præp. Evang. 9.18ff.

It is in their treatment of the life of Moses that they are important for this study. Both as Jews are writing for gentiles about the greatest Jew who ever lived. Their material, though it is essentially from the Old Testament, is so presented that the Hellenistic world may recognize and understand in the light of its own culture and institutions the character and qualities of an alien religious leader. Not least among the Greek concepts used is that of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

There are in fact three sources in addition to the Pentateuch for the life of Moses. Philo and Josephus follow similar traditions, and the latter may have used the former. Quite separate, however, is the romance of Artapanus (c. 50 B.C.) preserved only in part by Eusebius.¹ What little has survived of this was certainly not followed by the other two writers. According to Artapanus, Moses is the archetypal sage. He is the teacher of Orpheus, the inventor of writing, and the creator of Egyptian civilization. He is also accounted worthy of *ἰσοθέου τιμῆς*.² In another section a scene is described which resembles stories of Pythagoras and Apollonius. Moses, thrown into prison at the new Pharaoh's command, escapes through the doors which open before him and enters the king's bedchamber. Pharaoh, awakened from sleep, wants to know the name of the Israelites' God. As soon as this is whispered in his ear, he collapses. Moses revitalizes him and the king writes down the name on a paper which is then sealed. A priest, who interrupts at this point, is able to read what is written on the paper and simultaneously drops down dead. Two common motifs, the reading of a sealed letter and incarceration, have been grafted onto the legend of Moses by a Jew who was familiar with legendary material in the Greek world concerning the concept of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.³ Finally, Artapanus alone describes Moses as

¹Eusebius *Præp. Evang.* 9.27. I. Lévy, *La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, pp. 137ff., believed that Artapanus was following a Pythagorean source which he calls Ps.-Hecataeus (c. 100 B.C.) and that Philo and Josephus followed a separate tributary of this.

²Eusebius *Præp. Evang.* 9.27.

³Cf. Philostr. *VA* 3.16; 8.30; Lucian *Alex.* 19-21. The parallel passages here are not too close. It is the general idea that is the same, and this may have been picked up from any number of sources.

"long-haired" (Eusebius Præp. Ev. 9.27, 436d), and the parting of the Red Sea with his staff is effected by the command of his *Θεία φωνή* (9.27, cf. 21.736a).

Philo and Josephus differed enormously in the organization of their material, but the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* may be seen equally in the two accounts. Josephus did not write a *βίος*. His Life of Moses was part only of a greater whole which sought to magnify Jewish history. The details and impact of Moses' career, however, as set out in the Jewish Antiquities, allow us to see the biographical portrait on no smaller scale.

Philo was more conscious of what he was doing. His Life of Moses was independent of his other writings and intended to show the superiority of the Jewish lawgiver over all others and the immutability of his laws throughout the many vicissitudes of his people.¹ He is characterized under four headings, the first two of which, king and legislator, are often identical: the one writes, the other enforces laws. Philo distinguishes these two functions in Moses. As military general he is the equal of Alexander, and as wise lawmaker and politician he is a match for Plato. He is the embodiment of the philosopher-king. To this are added the further characteristics, not unknown in the Greek world though differently conceived, of priest (mediator) and prophet (spokesman) of God. To philosopher-king we should add the *σωτήρ* of mystery-religions and the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* of the Pythagoreans. And so, what was for the most part only an ideal to the Greeks, Philo claimed had been realized for the Jews.

From the beginning, it must be understood that a portrait of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* in the fullest sense, that is when the man falls little short of being himself a god, is plainly out of the question. The very strong line of demarcation between man and God in Hebrew theocracy is carried over in Philo and, to a lesser degree, in Josephus. Similarly the real purpose of miracle is the manifestation of God's power to his people or to their adversaries. But in neither is God so predominantly in the foreground as He is in the Old Testament.

¹See E. Bréhier, Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie (Paris, 1950), pp. 7f.

Nor does Moses remain as completely human as he does there.¹ Indeed Josephus often attempts to outdo the biblical wonders by amplification or intensification of detail.² It is hoped to show how both authors, irrespective of purpose or even consciousness, had adapted for their descriptions of Moses' life features, from whatever source, which a gentile would recognize as identical with the known category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

For convenience and to save repetition the references selected from both authors will be discussed together. In general, only where Old Testament details undergo transformation with the Hellenistic world in mind will these be considered. There are obviously many facts drawn directly from the Old Testament which alone would cause the average gentile to wonder.

In Exodus there is no mention of Josephus's prophecy that a leader of the Jews was to be born in Egypt, or of the revelation to Moses' father that his son was to be this leader (AJ 2. 205-216).³ According to Philo, Moses' beauty at birth was an outstanding feature (*γεννηθεὶς... ὅψιν ἐνέφαιεν ἀστεροτέραν ἢ κατ' ἰδιώτην* VM 1.9).⁴ Josephus adds that the birth-pains were easy so as to conceal the mother's delivery (AJ 2.218). Both Philo and Josephus explain that the exposure of the child was designed to place him in the providential care of God (VM 1.10-12; AJ 2.219ff). Philo adds that it was part of the divine plan (*ἐπινοία Θεοῦ*) for the child's mother to become his nurse (VM 1.17). And it was the baby's size and beauty that enchanted Pharaoh's daughter (VM 1.15; AJ 2.224).

Moses was an advanced child and was weaned at an abnormally early age (VM 1.18-19). His intelligence far outstretched his years, as

¹In the Septuagint the phrase used is *ἄνθρωπος Θεοῦ*, never *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

²Elsewhere, as if to please all tastes, Josephus rationalizes or suspends judgement with a formulaic phrase. See AJ 1.108 and cf. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 1.48, 1.

³In the Old Testament the reason for Pharaoh's decision to execute all male children of the Israelites is his fear of their large population (Exodus 1.9-16).

⁴The *ἀστεῖος* of LXX is used in Acts 7.20; Hebrews 11.23.

could be seen in childhood games (AJ 2.230). Again his beauty was noticed with amazement by all (VM 1.18; AJ 2.230). The princess told her father of his divine beauty and noble spirit (AJ 2.232). On this occasion the king took hold of Moses, embraced him, and affectionately placed the diadem on his head. The child at once took it off and threw it to the floor. The priests were only too quick to point out the unlucky omen, and Pharaoh's hesitation to have him killed is attributed by Josephus to the beneficent foresight of God (AJ 2.233-6).

Philo gives further details of his early education. He did not delight in fun and games, but always was modest and respectful in listening and looking and paid attention to what would profit his soul (VM 1.20). Teachers came from various places, some unbidden; fees were paid to those who had travelled from Greece!¹ But Moses soon became too advanced for them to teach him further, so that in his case it was thought to be ἀνάμνησις rather than μάθησις. He even posed questions which they found difficult to answer (VM 1.21). He became an ardent seeker of truth and his mind was incapable of receiving any falsehood (VM 1.24).

So much for Moses the wonder-child. These are very prominent non-biblical features and it is not to be expected that all of them were drawn from Rabbinical tradition.² Prior to his religious calling Moses as a young man showed exceptional moral perfection. At a time when passions are usually most fierce he displayed amazing temperance and self-control (VM 1.25-26).³ This, says Philo cautiously, led

¹The Egyptians, naturally, taught him harmony, music and science (VM 1.23; cf. Pl. Leg. 656d, 799a, 819a). From them he also learnt the wisdom of "symbols" and received instruction in their religion. The Greeks taught him the normal curriculum and the Chaldaeans astronomy (VM 1.23).

²The so-called Midrash or Haggadah (interpretation and amplification) of Scripture contain many parallels, especially with Josephus. See H. St. J. Thackeray in the Loeb translation of Josephus vol. IV pp. 12f. and references in his footnotes to the text. See also the parallel citations in the French Pude translation (ed. T. Reinach) by J. Weille.

I. Lévy, *op. cit.*, pp. 137ff., without sufficient evidence, sees the true origin in the Pythagorean legend.

³The analogy with a team of horses is, of course, paralleled in Plato's *Phaedrus* 246b.

everyone to wonder about the nature of the mind which his body contained "like some image within a shrine":

τίς ἄρα ὁ ἐνοικῶν αὐτοῦ τῷ σώματι καὶ ἀγαλματοφορούμενος
νοῦς ἐστὶ, πότερον ἀνθρώπειος ἢ θεῖος ἢ μικτὸς
ἐξ ἀμφοῦν, διερευνώμενοι, τῷ μηδὲν ἔχειν τοῖς πολλοῖς
ὅμοιον, ἀλλ' ὑπερκρύπτειν καὶ πρὸς τὸ μεγαλύτερον ἐξηγήθαι
(VM 1.27).

Divine nature was difficult for Jewish orthodoxy, but one could, like the Aristotelian tradition, suspend judgement on certain individuals "such as Pythagoras".¹ Here the famous three-fold definition of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is applied by Philo to Moses. But it may not be a simple plagiarism.² The Aristotelian corpus may also be availing itself of a current formula for comprehending a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Certainly the Greeco-Roman world would be expected to understand what Philo meant by it.

Moses' life of virtue continued until the day of his calling. Bodily needs were given no more than the necessary satisfaction (VM 1.28-29). Even later, as king, he lived a modest life without property, slaves, or taxes (ibid. 152). He ate the same food and wore the same clothing as a private citizen (153).³ If he had an abundance of anything it was of wisdom, temperance, and justice (154), his main concern in life being to cultivate the soul (152, cf. 29). Needless to say, he practised what he preached (29) and everything he attempted was done well. Very appropriately, he proved an excellent shepherd and his flock increased under him in quality and number (63-64).

In return for this moral perfection Moses was made the privileged servant of God. Both Philo and Josephus, in the main, follow the account of the burning bush in Exodus.⁴ After his calling

¹ Cf. Aristotle On the Pythagoreans Fr. 192 (Rose) = Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 31 τὸ μὲν ἐστὶ θεός, τὸ δὲ ἄνθρωπος, τὸ δὲ οἶον Πυθαγόρας and see above, p. 36.

² It would appear to support an early date for this Aristotelian treatise.

³ Cf. Josephus AJ 3.212.

⁴ Exodus ch. 4; VM 1.65-67; AJ 2.264ff. In Josephus all three of the later signs are performed on the spot.

he becomes a powerful worker of wonders. Philo sees the relationship between Moses and God as that of pupil to teacher (VM 1.80). In Josephus dependence on God is sometimes stressed, sometimes entirely suppressed.

The **θεός ἀνὴρ** now fully initiated comes into contact with the rulers of the world. The magical contest in which Moses' rod-serpent devours those of the Egyptian priests leads into the narrative of the ten plagues. Previously mocked and accused of sorcery (AJ 2.284), Moses by this amazing feat declares his power to be god-given (286). In Philo the fact is recognized without the need of Moses' words (VM 1.94).¹ But in neither case does assertion or acknowledgement achieve any good. The Egyptians obstinately persist in their cruelty and behave in a manner which only invites fresh disasters. The ten plagues, more spectacularly described by the historian than the philosopher, eventually bring liberation for the Israelites, and Moses is established as their king.

At this point Philo begins his portrait of the ideal wise ruler, the philosopher-king. He is very much the servant-king, whom we know from Dio Chrysostom, chosen by reason of his excellence and benevolence, and ruling with his people's interests close to his heart (VM 1.148ff). In return for his moral excellence he is rewarded by God with powers over the natural elements in the world. This, says Philo, is not surprising since in the words of the proverb friends share their possessions (**κοινὰ τὰ φίλων**) and the prophet is the friend of God (VM 1.156).² This interpretation of a Pythagorean platitude appears in the middle of a decisively Greek section of the Life, where the **σπουδαῖος ἄνθρωπος** is portrayed who possesses nothing, yet everything, and who is **κοσμοπολίτης** (VM 1.157). Philo takes his Greek ideas further: Moses, his wise man, was not only God's partner, he was also deemed worthy of the same title and was called **θεός καὶ βασιλεύς** of the whole race (158). This bold departure from Philo's usual moderation may be explained in terms of the current worship of

¹ AJ 2.286 **δεῖξω δὲ οὐ κατὰ γοητείαν...**, κατὰ δὲ θεοῦ πρόνοιαν καὶ δύναμιν φαινόμενα. VM 1.94 **ὡς μήκετι νομίζεν ἀνθρώπων σοφίσματα καὶ τέχνας εἶναι τὰ γινόμενα πεπλάσμενας πρὸς ἀπάτην, ἀλλὰ δύναμιν θεοο-τέραν τῆν τούτων αἰτίαν, ἣ πάντα δρᾶν εὐμαρές.**

² Cf. De Abr. 235 and Exodus 3.12, 17.

political rulers.¹ Thus would be combined in the life of Moses two contradictory Graeco-Roman ideals, those of divine king and wise man. Moreover, his life was like a picture, *πάγκαλον καὶ θεοειδές*; a paradigm for all who are willing to copy it (158).

It is true that *perfectus sapiens* and *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, though often interchangeable, are essentially different types. Philo's wise king, however, possesses the visible abnormal power and authority of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Here too the narrative is picked up by Josephus, and the account of Moses in the desert is of a wonder-working charismatic leader of his people.

According to Philo, an unknown route was taken across the desert, but a tall pillar-like cloud went before them shining by night and day. He conjectures that a guardian angel was concealed within it (VM 1.166). The same cloud forms a rear-guard as they cross the Red Sea (178).² There follows the miraculous journey through the desert, the provision of food and water, and various hostilities. Wonders related are mainly those of the Old Testament, but a few points need to be noticed. Josephus makes Moses' staff almost a magic wand.³ Yet a rationalistic explanation is given for the miracle of the quails and the purification of the well of Mar.⁴ The battle against the Amalekites, as told by Josephus contains in Moses' raised hands the idea of sympathetic magic (AJ 3.53ff). So long as his hands were held up high the Israelites were for that reason victorious. And so Aaron and Hur support the arms when Moses is tired. The notion of magic is only tacitly implied in the Old Testament (Exodus 17.11-12), and Philo explains the whole incident by allegory (VM 1.219).⁵

¹Philo may have been using Exodus 4.16, where the Hebrew reads "You shall be to him as (a) god".

²Cf. AJ 2.244ff. for the account of Moses as leader of the Egyptian army in the desert.

³AJ 2.338 (Red Sea); 3.35-37 (water from rock); 3.38 (Hypnotism?).

⁴AJ 3.25 (quails); 3.8 (well). Philo VM 1.211 gives a possible explanation for the water gushing from the rock. Cf. also AJ 3.38. Josephus compares the crossing of the Red Sea to a similar feat of Alexander (cf. Strabo 14.666f.; and Arrian 1.26, where the experience is *οὐκ ἄνευ τοῦ θείου*).

⁵Allegory in Philo is often in addition to historicity. See H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, 1948), Ipp. 347ff.

In the second book of the Life of Moses Philo describes the functions of lawgiver, priest, and prophet.¹ The fact that Moses combined in himself all three functions, as well as that of king, is not without the πρόνοια of God (VM 2.3). As a priest such was his piety that he became φιλόθεός τε καὶ θεοφιλής (VM 2.67). He received direct communion with God,² and after his forty days on Mt. Sinai he descended with a countenance more beautiful and more wondrous to behold than before. His eyes shone with a brightness so intense that no one could look into them for any long time (VM 2.69-70).³ Moses' prophetic faculty was of the ecstatic type.⁴ His predictions and instructions concerning the manna from heaven could not have been so accurate had not a θείον πνεῦμα guided his mind to the truth (VM 2.265).

These functions are noticed, though not systematically arranged by Josephus. In describing the symbolism of the tabernacle and of the priests' vestments Josephus answers the malicious slander brought against his people. On reflection, he says, men will find Moses the lawgiver a θείος ἀνὴρ and the accusation of blasphemy unwarrantable (AJ 3.129-180). The authority of his law down to the present day is confirmed and examples are cited of his superhuman power (τῆς ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων... δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ AJ 3.318). So divine did the legislation seem that Moses was considered a being of a superior nature (φύσεως κρείττονα AJ 3.320).

It is to be expected that Moses should know the day of his death (VM 2.291; AJ 4.177, 315). He also knows how he is to be buried and mourned (VM 2.291). Many predictions were made by him to his people before he left them (VM 2.291; AJ 4.303--in hexameters!). Philo views his end not as death but as a transportation to heaven and to immortality (VM 2.288). Josephus provides the details. It is a secret departure; the people are prevented from following Moses and

¹ Much of this second book has little direct relevance to the present study.

² Cf. VM 2.163, where Moses cannot bear to leave his unique dialogue with God when disturbed by the clamorous worship of the Golden Calf.

³ The "form" of the tabernacle imprinted on Moses' mind (VM 2.76) is, of course, a Platonic idea.

⁴ E.g. VM 2.250, ὁ δὲ προφήτης... οὐκέτ' ἂν ἐν ἑαυτῷ θεοφορεῖται κτλ.

the elders. When they reached Mt. Abaris, only Joshua and Eleazar were allowed to continue. While he was bidding these two farewell, a cloud descended and he disappeared into a ravine (AJ 4.323-326). He lived to be one hundred and twenty years old (AJ 4.327); few were to equal him as a general, none as a prophet, since whatever he said, it appeared that one was hearing the words of God Himself (AJ 4.329).

We may conclude that, although it was not necessarily their aim to write of Moses as a Graeco-Roman *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, both Philo and Josephus betray their knowledge of the category and occasionally make full use of it. Erudite references to Greek literature were an accepted practice of the times. To be an industrious compiler and copyist of earlier works, far from exciting disapprobation, came to be expected of an author. There is, however, no evidence of a literature here being copied and adapted. I. Lévy, who believed that the Jewish writers were drawing their material from a Pythagorean tradition, adapting the circumstances to Moses' life and superimposing these onto the basic biblical account, may only have exaggerated his case.¹ There are obvious parallels with Pythagoras, but also with a host of other personalities who may be said to fit this type.² In every case these traditions on *θεῖος ἀνδρῶν* will originally have been oral and only sporadically set down in writing. And oral traditions are richer in detail, for when an author begins to write down a legend he usually selects and therefore considerably reduces the quantity of his material. From such a common fund both Philo and Josephus, and Antapenus before them, probably took their ideas.³

¹I. Lévy, op. cit., p. 151, admits that the essential details of Pythagoras' "ascension" must be supplied from Philostratus's Life of Apollonius, which he then must believe is a copy of Apollonius's Life of Pythagoras.

²For example, the death of Moses may be compared with the deaths of Romulus (Livy 1.16; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 2.56, 2) Aeneas (Dion. Hal. ibid. 1.64, 4), Heracles (Apollodorus 2.7, 15) and Alexander (Ps.-Callisthenes 3.33).

³In the case of the Jewish writers this common fund may not have been entirely Graeco-Roman. Cf. also above, p. 229 n.2. For the deified Moses in Jewish art see M. Rostovtzeff, Dura-Europos and its Art (Oxford, 1938), p. 108; and for Rabbinic traditions of Moses see O. Daube, New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1952), pp. 5-9.

The Later Biographical Tradition

It remains to see how far the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* passed into the biographical literature of the third, fourth and later centuries. Philostratus does not make use of the concept in his Lives of the Sophists. He never wrote in sufficient detail about any one sophist for such a portrait to be realistically applied. And he could not expect people to take him seriously about Apollonius of Tyana if he were to write in the same way about others. Sophists whom he undoubtedly admired were enthusiastically acclaimed, but never revered.

Soon after Philostratus came the Lives of Diogenes Laertius. Again, no serious attempt is made to interpret any one life in terms of the concept of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Nevertheless where isolated details normally associated with such a full portrait occur, Diogenes includes them in his hotchpotch. But he shows no interest in that aspect of the tradition. If anything, he prefers to ridicule the abnormal qualities of men like Pythagoras and Empedocles in his own epigrammatic poetry.

The neo-Platonic Lives of Pythagoras genuinely belong to the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* tradition and are influenced by Philostratus's full treatment. Their significance has been discussed in an earlier chapter.¹ To Porphyry, however, belongs also a Life of Plotinus, placed at the beginning of his edition of the Enneads. Though no less reverent, it was written by a more subdued hand and contains less miracle than the biography of Pythagoras. In any case Plotinus was not a wonder-worker or theurgist in the later sense of that word. In his day it had become, perhaps, less respectable to deal in the kinds of miracle-mongering that Pythagoras and Apollonius were able to achieve with impunity.²

But we do know that magic was practised against Plotinus by a rival, Olympias of Alexandria. Porphyry tells us that he knew exactly when the spells were being cast and that his superior soul caused them to recoil on the magician (chs. 53-55). Any superhuman power he

¹See above, ch. II pp. 42ff.

²See A. H. Armstrong, "Was Plotinus a Magician?" Phronesis 1 (1955), pp. 73ff. and idem in The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 207ff.

possessed was due to his superior intellect. Thus he could point out the thief of a necklace from among his own slaves (ch. 61), and predict the futures of children living in his household (ch. 62).

Although no claim to divine status was made, others were prepared to recognize this in Plotinus. Porphyry is pleased to relate that when an Egyptian priest conjured up his guardian spirit in the temple of Isis, it turned out to be a god not a daemon (chs. 56-59). Noble men and women on the point of death entrusted to him their property and children *ὡς ἱερῶ τι καὶ θεῶ φύλακι* (ch. 49). An oracle of Apollo attested his godlike nature (ch. 128) and he attained a vision of the Highest God four times (ch. 130). His death was attended by one wonder: a snake crept under his bed and disappeared down a hole in the wall (ch. 2).

The Lives of neo-Platonist philosophers were recorded by Eunapius (c. A.D. 345-420). Here the epithets *θεπέσιος, θεῖος, θεϊότατος*, occur frequently. This is, perhaps, natural because one aim of the neo-Platonist philosopher was unification (*ἔνωσις*) with the ultimate divine being, the One. Again, the more theurgic a philosopher is, the more appropriate becomes the description of him in terms of the concept of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Thus little of relevance is said of Porphyry¹ or Plotinus, much more of Iamblichus. The last mentioned is said to possess the power of levitation at prayer, second sight or clairvoyance of past events, and the ability to work more spectacular wonders (VS 458), 459). The veneration of Maximus, Prohaeresius and Chrysanthius is variously attested (VS 477, 490, 500). And Sosipatra, wife of Eustathius, is given a comparatively full treatment as female theurgist. Eunapius describes not only her powers of prescience and clairvoyance and her adoration as a god, but also the initiation of the young child into magic practices by two superhuman² visitors to her father's farm (467ff.).

Later editions, commentaries and accounts of Plato's philosophy were introduced by a preliminary and short life. Gradually a late legend grew and Plato became in some respects a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. There

¹ Porphyry does cast out a devil (VS 457).

² On these visitors Eunapius comments *εἴτε ἥρωες, εἴτε δαίμονες, εἴτε τι θεϊότερον ἦσαν γένος* (VS 467). Marinus's pious Life of the fifth-century philosopher Proclus is in the same tradition as Eunapius and Porphyry.

is only a hint of a superhuman birth in Apuleius (De dog. Plat. 1.180) and Diogenes Laertius (D.L. 3.2) and otherwise a complete absence of miracle. The sixth-century Life of Olympiodorus (the introduction to his commentary on I Alcibiades) confirms that Apollo was Plato's father and adds the miraculous feeding of the infant by bees (2.11-24)-- a story related also of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar and Virgil.¹ But there is no full portrayal of a θεῖος ἀνὴρ apart from the birth-legends.² The slightly later anonymous Life (a prolegomena to Platonic philosophy) adds an oracle that Plato became a god after his death (6.7ff.). But there is no trace of the wonder-worker in any of the Lives of Plato. The absence of an early legend probably accounts for this. It was only the later religious approach to his philosophy that encouraged a belief in the divine mind of the author.³

In the fourth century St. Athanasius (c. A.D. 295-373) wrote a detailed Life of Antony the hermit (d. c. A.D. 356/7). His purpose, not dissimilar to that of Philostratus and the neo-platonist biographers of Pythagoras, was to hand down to posterity the life of an ideal monk to serve as model for those who sought perfection in the monastic life.⁴ Although parallels with pagan traditions should not be pressed too closely, Athanasius must have been aware of the mode of description for a θεῖος ἀνὴρ, for the concept, as it is known in Graeco-Roman literature, is now totally fused into early Christian hagiography.⁵

The main theme of the Life of Antony is the vivid description of a very austere asceticism and a constant subjection to violent attacks from demons. There is no wonderful birth or death, but the miracle which does attend his blameless life is only what may be expected of any θεῖος ἀνὴρ. He saw visions of God (chs. 10, 65, 66), in

¹See L. Bieler, ΘΕΙΟΣ 'ΑΝΗΡ, II p. 97.

²This also true of the Lives of Virgil.

³See H. Leisegang, "Der Gottmensch als Archetypus" in Eranos Jahrbuch 18 (1950), p. 27.

⁴R. T. Feyer, St. Athanasius: Life of St. Antony (London, 1950), p. 11; cf. R. Reitzenstein, op. cit., pp. 55-59; I. Lévy, Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore, pp. 141ff.

⁵Athanasius lacks the cruder elements associated with the apocryphal New Testament writings (see ch. IX) and probably owes less to them than to the pagan encomiastic biography.

one of which his soul stepped out of his body and travelled through the air (65). He was under God's protection as is demonstrated by the safe crossing with his friends of the crocodile-infested canal of Arsinoe (ch. 15). Many monks were attracted into the desert and a community of hermits gathered around him (ch. 44). He displayed the usual powers of clairvoyance and prescience (chs. 57-62, 82) and performed healings (chs. 70, 83-87) and exorcisms (chs. 63-64). Moreover, with the confidence of a Pythagoras he forbade wild animals to damage the small vegetable garden where he grew food for his visitors (ch. 50). Finally, at the age of one hundred and five, he had a premonition of his approaching death (ch. 89).

From this early Christian document the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* (with some modification) is passed on to later hagiographical traditions about the hermits of the Egyptian desert collected in Rufinus's Historia monachorum and Palladius's Historia Lausiaca (towards the end of the fourth and into the fifth centuries). It reappears in medieval collections of legends about the later saints, for example in the Acta Sanctorum and Analecta Bollandiana. The pagan conception of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* has shared the destiny of so many other aspects of the ancient world. Although Greece and Rome were to suffer eclipse, so much of their thought, culture, and civilization was to survive as it was carried down through the ages in various forms.

CHAPTER IX

EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

It is important, if also obvious, to remember that the world of Apollonius was the world of Christ and Paul. In the second half of the first century the earliest of the New Testament writings were taking shape, and these were soon to be followed by a superabundance of imitations and supplementations. Some of this later literature was composed within fifty years of either side of the probable date for Philostratus's Life of Apollonius.¹ These canonical and apocryphal New Testament documents are invaluable as sources for our knowledge of life in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire. It is natural to expect that the various Christian communities where they took origin will have been influenced to some degree by the cultural ideas of the Graeco-Roman world.

The concept of the *θεὸς ἀνὴρ* in Christian literature will now be examined. Influences, where these can be proved, or parallel development of pagan and Christian conceptions will be discussed; and, in particular, a comparison will be made of the life of Apollonius with that of Christ, and the possible connection between the Graeco-Roman *θεὸς ἀνὴρ* and certain aspects of Christology.

¹Others belonged to the fourth and fifth centuries and are mere imitations of the more important second-or third-century documents.

New Testament Apocrypha

We shall consider first the apocryphal New Testament, for in this collection of writings the parallels with pagan literature are strong. The discussion can be confined to gospels and acts:¹ there is little of relevance to it in apocryphal epistles and apocalypses.

Apocryphal Gospels

Of the apocryphal gospels it is those which deal with infancy and childhood that mainly concern us.

Interest in the birth of Christ was not of primary importance for the earliest writers; when the nativity was accepted into the gospel tradition any interest in the narrative was secondary to the theology, and a certain sobriety was maintained in the details. Two incidents only in Jesus' early childhood were considered of sufficient importance to warrant inclusion, namely the flight into Egypt and the visit to the Temple in Jerusalem. But the account of the divine birth of Jesus apparently led to hostile criticism from non-Christians, and many then believed that the first and third Gospels were inadequate to meet the calumny and misrepresentation.² Extra details were required in order to support and confirm what the Christians themselves believed to be true. So important to some was their faith that events which would, if they had happened, answer possible objections were believed by them actually to have happened. The additional material will also have had its own attraction to those who were naturally curious about the early life of their Lord and his parents.

¹The standard work is E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (ed.), The New Testament Apocrypha, Eng. transl., ed. R. McL. Wilson (2 vols. London, 1962-63). The Greek texts may be found in C. Tischendorf, Evangelia Apocrypha (1886) and R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha (1891-1903). Cf. also B. Altaner, Patrologie (Freiburg, 1938); J. Quasten, Patrology (Utrecht, 1950-). The standard English translation is M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford, 1924 and 1950).

²E. g. Origen c. Celsum 1.33 (Pantheros); 2.30; 6.27; Justin Dial. 17.108, 117; Tertullian Ad Nat. 1.14; Adv. Marc. 3.23.

The result is the so-called Childhood Gospels of the second century and later. Incorporated in them are traditions from several sources. The motif of Childhood, as has been seen, plays a prominent part in the descriptions of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. The Greek concept, therefore, is illustrated on nearly every page. On the other hand, if these writers had seriously in mind the Greek *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* it is strange to find that they stop short at childhood. It must be assumed that they based their works essentially on Christian not pagan traditions, and that their aim was to supplement but not repeat the gospel stories and to strengthen, where it was deemed necessary, belief in the divine origin of Christ.

In the Protoevangelium of James the author's purpose is to glorify Mary, mother of Jesus, thereby answering slanders brought against her in order to discredit Jesus.¹ She is said to be the daughter of a wealthy father (1.1, cf. 4.2 - 3) and of royal descent (David's line 10.1). At six months she was able to walk seven steps (6.1), and when three years old she danced with joy on the third step of the Temple altar (7.3). At the age of twelve she was assigned to an aged widower in order that her purity might be perpetuated (8.2).

These are a few of the ways in which it could be shown that Mary was no ordinary child. In what follows, the canonical Gospels are closely adhered to. But there are two points worth noticing. First, a cave instead of a stable is chosen as a more suitable birth-place for Jesus (18.1).² Caves were often associated with the birth of a god or a divine hero. The cave at Dicte in Crete was the reputed birth-place of Zeus, the god Trophonius lived in a cave, Mithras was sprung from a rock and worshipped in caves. A less humble, less obscure and more mysterious spot is evidently thought necessary for the divine Jesus first to appear on earth. Secondly, at the moment of birth the natural world (sky, rivers, men, sheep) lies still and motionless as if either in expectation of or in sympathy with some great event (18.2). This motif of stillness, more famous perhaps for

¹Dated within the second century but after A.D. 150. See E. Hennecke, op. cit., I pp. 371-72. It is a composite work, parts of it being as late as fifth-century additions, but more has its origin in the second century. See A. F. Findlay, Byways in Early Christian Literature (Edinburgh, 1923), pp. 149ff.

²See A. F. Findlay, op. cit., pp. 163f., nn. 159-61.

its occurrence in the story of Sleeping Beauty, is recorded also for the birth of Buddha.¹ The sympathy, though not the absolute stillness, of Nature accompanies the birth of the child in Virgil's Fourth Eclogue and is found in a Sibylline Oracle.² It is used by Milton in his Ode On the Morning of Christ's Nativity (see stanzas 4, 6, 7 of the Hymn), and may lie behind the line of the nineteenth-century hymn: "The world in solemn stillness lay to hear the angels sing."³

The Protoevangelium ends with Herod's orders for the slaughter of all newly born infants. But the story of Jesus' childhood is continued in the Infancy Gospel of Thomas,⁴ the purpose of which was to depict the young boy as an infant prodigy. The stories related here, lacking both restraint and discretion, became immensely popular and found their way into the later apocryphal gospels. Oriental influence is not difficult to surmise for much of the exorbitant detail. The often wicked and spiteful enfant terrible, as Findlay calls him,⁵ would hardly appeal to western notions about the θεῖος ἀνήρ. This collection of magic and wonder, often with neither sense nor motive, might almost be a shocking parody, were it not clear that its author, so far from causing offence, was providing for the tastes of his avid eastern readers by filling the gaps in their knowledge which more sober accounts had left between the baby in the cradle and the boy at the Temple.

¹See A. F. Findlay, op. cit., pp. 155f., n. 145, quoting W. Bauer, Das Leben Jesu (Tubingen, 1909), p. 67 for Buddha: "Flowers partially open their cups and yet do not bloom; heavenly virgins appear motionless in the air; the winds are become still; the rivers cease to flow; all the heavenly bodies are in a state of rest; and all human activity is arrested." See also E. Norden, Die Geburt des Kindes (Leipzig, 1924) passim, and cf. Ignatius Epistle to Ephesians 19.

²Sibylline Oracles 8.174ff. ("When the child was born, the earth stretched itself out joyfully towards him; the heavenly throne laughed and the world rejoiced."); Virgil Eclogues 4.18-25.

³The Methodist Hymnbook (London, 1933), No. 130.

⁴Dated within the second century, c. A.D. 150. See E. Hennecke, op. cit., I pp. 388ff.

⁵A. F. Findlay, op. cit., p. 173.

At five years of age the boy Jesus was a regular miracle-worker. He fashioned (live?) sparrows out of clay (1.2).¹ A youth who interfered in his playful miracles became withered at a word of command (3.1-3), another who accidentally bumped against him was cursed and immediately fell dead (4.1, cf. 14.2). All who reproached him for these deeds were struck blind (5.1). On another occasion a boy fell to his death from an upper building and the parents accused Jesus of pushing him. But he leapt down to the ground (unhurt) and raised the dead boy in order to prove them false. The boy denied the charge, all were amazed, God was praised for the sign, and Jesus was worshipped (9. cf. 17.1; 18.1). Recognition of Jesus as a god or an angel followed this sort of wonder (17.2; 18.2). Other miracles of a remedial nature were performed. By his touch he healed the wound in a woodcutter's foot and stopped him bleeding to death (10). His brother James while carrying wood was bitten by a viper. Jesus healed the wound by breathing upon it and the viper burst open (16).

All these things are written with sincerity in order to enhance the character of the boy Jesus. Any similarities which the details bear to the Graeco-Roman concept of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* are of a general rather than specific nature. The model for the narrative is obviously to be found in other New Testament writings, although the themes of the viper in the firewood and of the boy falling from an upper story have not necessarily been lifted from the Lucan Acts.

A feature, however, which does seem to be shared with the pagan conception of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* is that of personal superiority over one's teachers. Zacchaeus, who teaches Jesus his letters, is himself instructed by the boy in their allegorical meanings, and accordingly confesses that he was "not earthly born" (6-7). Linked to this is the idea of bewilderment concerning the nature of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Zacchaeus's perplexity is seen in his words: "for he is more than great, and I do not know whether to call him a god, or an angel, or anything else" (7.4; cf. 17.2). This recalls the famous Pythagorean dilemma of the Peripatetic tradition and the similar Philonic statement

¹References are to the Greek text A. With the sparrows cf. the Latin text ch. 1, where Jesus raises a dead fish! Also cf. Acts of Peter 13.

about the ambiguity of Moses' nature.¹

Later infancy gospels were little more than adaptations and elaborations of the two earlier works of James and Thomas. In them the theme of the glorification of Mary returns. As a three-year-old she spoke and walked like a mature person, and she was so beautiful that scarcely anyone could look into her face (Ps-Matthew 6). A demoniac girl is healed on account of Mary's pity (Arabic Gospel 14). Numerous healings are achieved by means of the newly washed clothes of Jesus or the water which his mother had used to wash him (ibid. 11, 17, 18, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33). A man who by witchcraft had been turned into a mule was restored when Mary placed Jesus on his back (ibid. 21, 22).² In the flight to Egypt the young child is able to tame dragons, lions, leopards and wolves, all of which worship him (Ps-Matthew 18, 19, 35). The journey itself is a wonderful one, taking only one instead of the normal thirty days (ibid. 22). Later when with a lioness and her whelps he crosses the river Jordan, the waters divide for him; he then commands the animals to depart and harm no one (ibid. 36).³ Finally, there is found in an excerpt from a Latin infancy gospel preserved in the Arundel Mss. the smile of the new-born babe, a feature which Virgil used in his Fourth Eclogue (chs. 60-63). The infant Jesus does not cry, but smiles sweetly at the midwife and a great light like lightning flashes from his eyes.⁴

¹Cf. Aristotle On the Pythagoreans Fr. 192 (Rose); Philo Vit. Mos. 1.27. For another possible parallel cf. the strange account in the Latin text (ch. 2) of quarrelling sparrows which fall into the lap of a schoolmaster and cause laughter from the boy Jesus. When reprimanded, he explains that he had corn in his hand and the birds were quarrelling over some of this which he had scattered and shown to them. In Philostratus VA 4.3 the excessive chirping of sparrows is interpreted by Apollonius as communication one to another that corn had been dropped onto the ground by a careless boy. These stories, if one is not dependent upon the other, must belong to some common fund.

²M. R. James, op. cit., p. 81, compares this miracle to an identical one told of St. Macarius in Palladius Hist. Lausiaca. In the Arabic Gospel Jesus is also brought into contact with the two robbers of Calvary and with various disciples, all of them as young boys. This is sheer entertainment!

³Pythagoras (Porph. Vit. Pyth. 23) gave similar instructions to a Daunian bear, and Apollonius (VA 5.42; 6.43) spoke the language of lions and dogs.

⁴See E. Hennecke, op. cit., I pp. 413ff., and M. R. James, Latin Infancy Gospels (n.p. 1927), pp. 68, 70.

The so-called Passion Gospels are largely expansions of the canonical versions. Any deviation may usually be explained in terms of apologetic for gnostic, docetic, anti-Jewish, or other views. At the same time, the miraculous elements are heightened, as is natural in an age when the divine was almost synonymous with the supernatural. Only two passages need detain us. In the Gospel of Nicodemus ("Acts of Pilate" 1.1; 2.5) the Jews in their evidence to Pilate accuse Jesus of being a sorcerer. Such a charge was the natural response of an unreceptive environment to a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, and if it is "typical", it is also a historically probable circumstance. In this Gospel and in the Gospel of Bartholomew there is a spectacular account of the Descent into Hell. The cue was undoubtedly taken from Christian material (Rom. 10.7, Eph. 4.9, I Pet. 3.19; 4.6), but there is nothing to prevent these authors from knowing that a Catabasis played an important part in the pagan legends of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.¹

Apocryphal Acts

Very little is known from the New Testament about the lives of the apostles. In the Lucan Acts biographical details even for Peter and Paul play a subordinate part. But in the second century the apostles, whose names were then synonymous with "authority", became the objects of divine veneration in many quarters of the Christian Church.² It is not surprising that when they became the standard for the pure Christian tradition people in the Church became eager to learn the more intimate details of lives and ministries. Earlier literature, predominantly concerned with the expectation of and preparation for Christ's second coming, was not required to satisfy any such desire. But when the need arose, there was no shortage of writers to supply the Christians with appropriate information.

The name of one such author, Leucius, is preserved at the head of a five-fold corpus of acts, all originally separate, which comprises

¹ Among heroes who descended to Hades were Heracles, Odysseus, Aeneas, Theseus, and Orpheus. Pythagoras is said to have made the journey (D.L. 8.23). A similar experience is related of Krishna, Arthur, the Sumerian Inanna, the hero of the Finnish Kalevala, and from time to time a Bodhisattva.

² Paul and Barnabas, of course, were accorded divine honours in their lifetime by non-Christians (Acts 14.8-13).

the Acts of John, Peter, Paul, Andrew, and Thomas.¹ Leucius could not have composed them all; he may have composed none. His name is attached specifically only to the Acts of John.²

The nature of these "Leucian" acts is very complex indeed. Evidently they followed the basic pattern of Luke, who himself was using a familiar literary form. But the title *πράξεις* and the outward form and arrangement of material is practically all that they have in common. Differences in emphasis and presentation of material are enormous. Luke was a theologian who wrote history in order to evangelize.³ His interest was not so much in the travels and personal miracles of the apostles as in their words and experiences when, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, they help to spread the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome.⁴ In the apocryphal acts theology is no longer the prime concern. All restraint is cast aside and the miraculous becomes an everyday experience and is used as the sole infallible proof of divine authority. The glorification of the personal fortunes of the apostles becomes the main theme in what is entertaining extravaganza rather than edifying history.

It has long been observed that these acts are not so much literary documents from the outset as the fixation in writing of popular stories from oral tradition.⁵ The various dogmatic, apologetic and polemic tendencies may well have been behind the oral traditions before they were written down. It is difficult not to see the close affinity of this literature with contemporary forms in the Graeco-Roman world, especially with the adventure romance or "aretalogue". The word *ἀρεταλογία* occurs in the title of no extant romantic writing; nor,

¹They were composed in the second or early third century. The five-fold corpus almost certainly existed in the fourth century, when it was used by Manichaeans in North Africa to replace the Lucan Acts. But the first clear notice of it is in Photius (*cod.* 114) in the ninth century. See A. F. Findlay, *op. cit.*, pp. 190f. and notes.

²Differences in both doctrine and style make it impossible for Leucius to have composed all five acts. Cf. M. R. James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, p. xxx. See also by the same author *Texts and Studies* (Cambridge, 1893) V.x, where James is of the opinion that the name was assumed on account of its similarity to Luke.

³E. Hennecke, *op. cit.*, II p. 171.

⁴The purpose of canonical Acts is much discussed. Here the general comparison of "Luke" with "Leucius" as literary forms is being maintained.

⁵See E. Hennecke, *op. cit.*, II pp. 32-34, cf. 176.

for that matter, is *πράξεις* found in non-Christian titles.¹ But among the many types of ancient romance²—erotic, pastoral, historic, adventuresome, fabulous, satiric—the aretatalogue took its position as one concerned with a portrayal of the exceptional life and achievements of some prominent personality, whether historical or legendary, together with such topographical and ethnographical information as found favour with the reading populace of the time. Both Lucian and Philostratus, without using as titles either *ἀρεταλογία* or *πράξεις*, were writing within the same literary genre as the authors of these Christian romances. Each had adapted for his own narrow purpose this common form. Essential differences of culture and tendency cannot diminish the unmistakable evidence for the familiar mode of narration. The same applies to differences of style and language: the diction of the New Testament gives colour to the apocryphal acts, just as that of Homer colours the romances of Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus, and that of Theocritus the pastoral novel of Longus.³

To return to the purpose of the "Leucian" acts, their authors' intentions seem to have been to supplement the scanty details of the earlier literature which only later became accepted as authoritative. There can be no question of any desire to replace the so-called orthodox accounts with encratite, gnostic, or docetic pictures; for in the second century no clear division had been made between orthodoxy and heresy.⁴ Their writings were intended to edify and to entertain. Sometimes they may be thought to have failed in the former and to have succeeded

¹For aretatalogue see above, ch. VII pp.173ff. The so-called Acts of the Pagan Martyrs is a title assigned by modern scholars. See Oxford Classical Dictionary s.v.

²It is a mistake to regard ancient romance as mainly erotic literature. The five extant novels form, as it were, a narrow genre within a wider one. For the comprehensive nature of romance in the ancient world see R. Helm, Der Antike Roman (Berlin, 1948).

³For this point see E. H. Haight, More Essays on Greek Romances (New York, 1945) p. 60.

⁴See especially W. Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum (Tübingen, 1934); cf. A. F. Findlay, op. cit., pp. 194-96, 236f; E. Hennecke, op. cit., II pp. 168f., 176f.

in the latter.¹ Nevertheless, many passages reveal a heart-felt warmth, a sense of moral earnestness, and the assurance of an invincible faith.

We shall look summarily at the five second-century acts and examine in them the more specific points of comparison with the popular conception in the Graeco-Roman world of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

The earliest of them is the Acts of John, which belongs to the middle of the second century.² It contains the raising of innumerable dead people, by which the apostle's spiritual insight and stature is enhanced. Like Apollonius, he was in particular demand at Smyrna and Ephesus; but wherever he went, he taught, preached and performed wonders.³ Even bed-bugs obeyed his commands (60-61)! The book, like parts of Luke, is in the form of a "We-narrative". The memoirs of Damis will, no doubt, have taken a similar shape. Eyewitness accounts from a faithful companion are appropriate for a religious aretalogue.

The admittedly late Greek text which Bonnet prints as the first seventeen chapters contains a remarkable episode in which John is summoned to Rome on the information of Jews who apparently had persuaded Domitian to divert his hatred from themselves to the Christians. On board the ship he amazed the sailors with his asceticism. When he reached Domitian's court, he was ordered to drink poison. This he did without harm and also revived a criminal who had just died from the same draught. There also he raised a girl whom an evil spirit had killed. All this served to impress the emperor, but John was banished to Patmos nonetheless. When Nerva revoked the sentence, he returned to Ephesus.⁴

The account of John's death is expanded in some manuscripts. In the Latin version a great light, so bright that no one could look

¹A. F. Findlay, op. cit., p. 196, quotes the judgement of Philastrius of Brescia (fl. c. A.D. 375) De Haer. 88, namely that they may be read for the moral edification of mature Christians but should not be put into the hands of all; and the view of Leo I, that they "should be utterly swept away and burnt". In modern times we may compare the biblico-historical novels, (e.g. The Robe, Barabbas, etc.) whose authors might find it difficult to differentiate their motives from some of these apocryphal writers.

²First mentioned by Clement Strom.: 6.9, 71. See E. Hennecke, op. cit., II pp. 188ff.; A. F. Findlay, op. cit., pp. 208ff.

³With ch. 55 (invitation of Smyrnaeans) cf. Philostr. VA 4.1.

⁴According to Tertullian and others, Domitian at Rome or a pro-consul at Ephesus cast John into a cauldron of boiling oil which did not harm him. See M. R. James, Apocryphal New Testament, p. 229. The cup of poison occurs (without Domitian) in the Latin text ch. 22. See ibid. p.262.

at it, appeared over him for a whole hour before he lay down and died, and even to the present day manna was to be seen issuing from his tomb.¹ A Greek version states that only the apostle's sandals were to be found on the day after his death and the earth above his tomb (?) was seen to move.²

Finally, in the Latin text, the confession of the priest Aristodemus to a proconsul at Ephesus that John "is a god hidden in human form" provides evidence of the popular conception of the θεός ἀνθρώπου in its full significance even among some Christians.³

The Acts of Peter is generally dated from A.D. 180-90.⁴ It is dependent on John for doctrinal details,⁵ and may fairly be described as an entertaining and instructive compilation of the oral traditions concerning Peter. Chief interest is assigned to the contest with Simon Magus and the martyrdom.

The scene is almost entirely set in Rome, where, after Paul's departure for Spain, Simon has been practising magic with some success. Since some of Simon's converts were now calling Paul a sorcerer, Peter was summoned to deal with the situation (chs. 1-4). The captain of the ship he took was told in a dream that Peter would safeguard the voyage; he cannot decide whether Peter is a god or a man, but he reckons him to be a servant of God (ch. 3). In Rome Peter preaches the gospel (ch. 7), heals the sick (chs. 19-21, 29, 31), and casts out devils (ch. 11),⁶ and raises the dead (chs. 26-27).

Simon's authority is challenged first by means of a dog with the voice of a human (ch. 12), and again by a seven-month-old baby with the voice of a man (ch. 15). By way of a further sign Peter brings

¹ Ibid., p. 270

² Codex Γ + U (Ibid., p. 270). For the sandal cf. D.L. 8.69 (of Empedocles).

³ Latin text Ch. 21. See Ibid., p. 264.

⁴ E. Hennecke, op. cit., II pp. 259ff., 275. The earliest direct attestation is in Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 3.3, 2.

⁵ A. F. Findlay, op. cit., p. 209; M. R. James, Apocryphal New Testament, p. xx.

⁶ In this exorcism the devil kicks to pieces a marble statue as it quits the young man. (Cf. Philostr. VA 4.20). Peter has water thrown over the pieces in order to restore them!

back to life a smoked tunny fish (ch. 13).¹ Meanwhile Simon is struck dumb until the day of the contest. This takes place on the Sabbath before a paying audience (chs. 23-29).² Peter wins because he can raise the dead permanently by a single word of command, whereas Simon uses technical movements of the body and can keep the corpses alive only for as long as he is standing near them. The result is that Peter is worshipped as a god (ch. 29), and the sick are brought in for him to heal (29, 31). Very little distinction seems to be made here between Christ and his apostle.

Meanwhile Simon, with the renewed fervour of Lucian's Peregrinus, decides on one final coup de theatre--his own ascension: he will fly away to heaven. However, he is brought down by Peter, stoned, and banished (chs. 31-33). Since his principal opponent has now been removed, Peter is soon to end his life; and his preaching to the Romans on continence only hastens that end. Characteristically, Nero is annoyed at his crucifixion, as he wanted to punish him more cruelly (ch. 41).

The popular and highly influential Acts of Paul (c. A.D. 185-195) was written by an Asian presbyter "out of love for Paul".³ No one need doubt his good faith; he sought to enhance and glorify the apostle by gathering together the legends which gave expression to the popular image of Paul at that time.⁴ He paid little attention to the canonical Acts and, had he endeavoured to deceive or to replace these, greater care would have been shown with regard to inconsistencies. It includes the martyrdom of the apostle and the so-called Acts of Paul and Thecla.⁵ But not all of the Acts of Paul has survived, and there

¹ Cf. Gospel of Peter Latin text, l. See above, p.243 n.1.

² For the magical contest as a stock feature in the life of a magus see E. M. Butler, Myth of the Magus, pp. 2f. For the Adversary (Gegenspieler) in the portrait of a θεῖος ἀνὴρ see L. Bieler, ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ, I pp. 42ff.

³ For the date see E. Hennecke, op. cit., II p. 351 and A. F. Findlay, op. cit., pp. 238f. The popularity and reputation of this book is attested by Tertullian De Baptismo 17; Eusebius Hist. Eccl. 3.25; Augustine Adv. Faustum 30.4.

⁴ Lack of miracle at Corinth suggests that there was no legend there. See E. Hennecke, op. cit., II p. 343.

⁵ See E. H. Haight, More Essays on Greek Romances, pp. 48ff.

are many incomplete manuscripts in Greek and Coptic.

In a portrait which is not always complimentary Paul's features are described sometimes like those of a man, sometimes like those of an angel (Acts of Paul and Thecla 3). But the people of Iconium in view of his encratite teachings are persuaded to call him a sorcerer (*ibid.* 15). Both Paul and Thecla at different times are protected in the arena. Rain protects Thecla from the flames, and a lioness fights beside her to the death. Paul is recognized by a lion whom he had previously converted, and a hail-storm protects both from the other beasts (*ibid.* 20-22; 33-34).¹ Legends such as these will have arisen from the persecutions of the first century. Other wonders of healing or raising the dead fit easily into the apocryphal apostolic tradition.² One detail, however, of his imprisonment at Ephesus recalls the wonder of Apollonius in chains at Rome (Philostr. VA 7.38). Paul's chains were loosed in order to convince two women visitors of the power of God. He accompanied them to the sea-shore and, after baptizing them, returned to his prison and shackles without anyone's knowledge of what had happened.³

The Acts of Andrew (?c. A.D. 200)⁴ is one continuation of conversions, exorcisms, and the raisings of dead people. At one stage thirty-eight dead men are washed ashore and restored to life (Epitome of Gregory of Tours ch. 24). Andrew is twice accused of being a sorcerer (*ibid.* 12, 18). At the same time, he is under the providence of God: angels advise him where to travel (9, 10), seas are calmed for him to journey in safety (8).

Two passages resemble the narrative in Philostratus. Andrew was asked to intervene in a situation where a boy's mother was playing Phaedra to his Hippolytus (4). The results are more spectacular

¹Cf. Coptic Fragment 8 (James) and "Paul in Ephesus" (Hennecke II pp. 369ff.).

²In the account of his martyrdom Paul, unlike Peter who was crucified, was beheaded and milk from his severed head spurted onto the soldiers' clothes. He made a resurrection appearance to Nero in which he warned the emperor of his own fate.

³E. Hennecke, op. cit., II pp. 369ff. ("Paul in Ephesus").

⁴This is the most fragmentary of the acts and many texts are of late origin. But Hennecke (op. cit. II 396) is in favour of the early date (not c. A.D. 260 as some) because of similarities in style, structure and content to the other Leucian acts.

than Apollonius's conversation with Timasion in Egypt (Philostr. VA 6.3ff). On another occasion Andrew was followed from Macedonia in two ships. As everyone wanted to travel in the apostle's boat and both boats were full, baggage and servants were placed in the larger one, and the people went with Andrew in the other (21). Faced with a similar situation Apollonius sought a larger boat in order to accommodate safely all who wanted to share his voyage (Philostr. VA 4.13).

The Acts of Thomas (c. A.D. 225-250) alone is preserved in its entirety. Originally a Syriac document it reflects the spirit of eastern Christianity.¹ The emphasis is on practical religion rather than theological speculation, and it has aptly been called a romance of conversion.² It describes within the conventional atmosphere of wonders the apostle's journeys in India and his message of asceticism tempered with compassion.

As travelling preacher and holy man Thomas affords a striking resemblance to Apollonius and the category of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. His wanderings, fantastic powers, the astonishing prodigies, the preaching and its double effect of conversion or antagonism all help to complete the picture. Thomas lives no differently from any other *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*: he too is accused of sorcery (16, 96, 101, 102, etc.); he drives out devils (42-47, 62ff.), he raises dead people (30-38, 51-61), usually in order to convert them or others; generally he inspires in men and women a life of purity. He makes predictions, he is warned in dreams, and even addressed by animals (see esp. 30ff., 39ff.).

When arrested, scourged and cast into prison by an Indian king, the apostle readily grants his fellow prisoners' request and prays for them. The crowd worships him as a god (106-108).³ He also was enabled to leave prison, perform baptisms, and return without anyone's knowledge through doors which opened for him (119-121, 159-162).⁴ He is forced to walk over red-hot tiles, but water gushes forth from the ground and swallows them up as soon as his feet are placed on

¹The author belongs to the eastern church centred at Edessa. The Gnostic character of the work illustrates the Gnostic Christianity of Syria in the third century. See E. Hennecke, op. cit., II pp. 426ff.

²A. F. Findlay, op. cit., p. 274.

³Cf. Philostr. VA 7.22, and 40.

⁴Cf. Philostr. VA 8.30; Artapanus apud Eusebium Hist. Eccl. 9.27.

them (139ff). He was aware of his impending death (149), and made several appearances after he had been killed by the sword (169). One of his bones was placed on the possessed body of the king's son; it changed to dust and the son was healed (170).

Later apocryphal acts were more extravagant imitations of the earlier five.¹ In the Acts of Peter and Andrew a camel is actually made to pass through the eye of a needle (14-21). The influence of adventure stories is seen in the Acts of Andrew and Matthew: Andrew is sent to rescue Matthew from the land of man-eaters and Jesus steers his ship. Paul in the Acts of Andrew and Paul pays a visit to the underworld! Finally, the Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena is the Christian counterpart, possibly antidote, to ancient erotic romances.²

From the literary point of view there is little to distinguish between portraits of individual apostles and Lucian's Alexander or Philostratus's Apollonius. It may be thought, however, that the concept of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* in the pagan world, if not more honestly conceived, was less crudely narrated: Apollonius as well as being a thaumaturge was a philosopher; Lucian accepted the distinguished teachers of Alexander; Pythagoras, Empedocles and Socrates were acknowledged as great thinkers of their day long before legends had turned them into *θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι*. Moreover, serious philosophical thinkers had given full consideration to the element of divinity in their notions of ideal statesman or sage. But in fact the same is true of early Christianity: existing side by side in the first two centuries are the unsophisticated popular traditions on the apostles and the more carefully balanced judgements of the first theologians. For example in Clement of Alexandria's Excerpta ex Theodoto a Gnostic picture is presented of the apostles as beings of superhuman dimensions. They are men whose "divine spark" has been quickened to such a degree that their material nature has been totally subordinated to this (3.1, 2).³ Ignatius also

¹ See E. Hennecke, op. cit., II pp. 571ff.

² See E. H. Haight, op. cit., pp. 66ff.

³ See C. K. Barrett, "The Apostles in and after the New Testament", Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok XX (1956) pp. 30-49, esp. pp. 34-37. The apostles become constellations (25.2); they are also able to confer by baptism what appears to be apotheosis (76.3).

believed that the apostles were to be differentiated from other men (Eph. 12.2; Trall. 3.3; Rom. 4.3).¹ Paul was aware of rival apostles whose conception of the office differed vastly from his own, or who were differently regarded by their followers. In particular, the *ψευδαπόστολοι* of I Cor. 10-13 seem to have been travelling preachers who relied largely on their verbal eloquence and physical stature and whose popularity was so great that the churches were prepared to pay for their services.²

We may conclude that the apocryphal gospels and acts were susceptible to more than one influence. The gospels were perhaps essentially based on the New Testament Canon. The acts in form, if not in content, were more akin to the aretalogue in Graeco-Roman literature, which produced Lucian's satirical sketches and Philostratus's biography of Apollonius. Literary tendencies of the first two centuries had influenced both Christian and pagan popular writings. And the concept of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* was undoubtedly recognized in some form by the Christian (or heretical Christian) writers who clearly were removed both in distance and time from the main stream of the new faith and whose outlook on life was accordingly influenced to a large extent by their pre-Christian environment.

Canonical New Testament

The Acts of the Apostles

When we turn to the Lucan Acts, the portrait of the apostolic figure which emerges there resembles in no small degree that of the apocryphal literature, though without the more fanciful teratology of the latter.

¹Cf. Eph. 11.2; Mag. 13.1; Trall. 2.2; 3.1; Philad. 6.1; Smyrn. 3.2 (C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 41).

²Lucian's charlatan cynics immediately come to mind. See above, p.208. For false prophets and false teachers in the New Testament cf. I Jn. 4.1ff.; 2 Pet. 2.1ff.; Titus 1.10-16; 2 Tim. 4.1-5; 6.3-6; 2 Thess. 2.1-4; 1 Thess. 2.3-7; Col. 2.4, 8, 16, 20-23; Philipp. 3.1-3; Gal. 1.6ff.

An atmosphere of wonder attends the life of the early Christian community. All private property was sold and the proceeds given to the apostles for distribution among those in need. For the rest, all things were held in common by the faithful (2.42-46; cf. 4.32-35; 6.1). Marvels and signs were frequently performed through the apostles but always attributed to the name of Jesus (3.12-16; 4.10, 30; cf. 14.3-4; 15.12). At the same time, certain individuals were singled out for their exceptional qualities. Stephen, for example, was a man "full of grace and power" (6.8; cf. 6.5). Philip the evangelist had four unmarried daughters "who possessed the gift of prophecy" (21.9).¹ Agabus, who made predictions to Paul, was recognized as a true prophet (11.27-28; 21.10-14). Others who only posed as prophets were denounced as *μῶσοι*. Elymas (or Bar-Jesus) was struck blind at the reproof of Paul (13.6-12). The seven sons of Sceva received such rough treatment from a bedevilled man they were trying to exorcize that many Christians who had been practising magic at Ephesus confessed their guilt through terror and publicly burnt their books of spells (19.13-19). Simon Magus became a believer when he saw in Philip a greater wonder-worker than himself (8.13), but he was rebuked by Peter for wanting to buy the gift of laying on of hands (8.18-23).²

There is evidence in Acts 5.15 for the popular worship of Peter as one who possessed *mana*. Here the sick hold out hope that even the apostle's shadow, if it passes over them, will produce a healing effect. Through prior knowledge he was able to see through the attempt of Ananias and his wife Sapphira to deceive the community; both when denounced dropped dead at his words (5.1-12). When by prayer he raised a dead woman, thus performing the ultimate marvel, the news spread throughout the district and many became believers (9.36-43). For the most part, however, it is through Christ that Peter performs miracles (3.12-16; 9.33-34; cf. 4.10). The centurion Cornelius fell to the ground and worshipped the apostle (*προσεκύνησεν*), but he was reprimanded with the words, "Stand up, for I too am only

¹Cf. Acts 19.6, where Ephesian converts after their baptisms prophesied and spoke in tongues.

²There can be no doubt that Simon believed that there was great magic power behind this ritual.

In 8.39 there is no more than a hint of wonder-travel for Philip "snatched away by the Spirit".

a man" (10.25-26).¹ Peter was nevertheless under the providential care of God. If his earlier release from prison was natural, the angel of the Lord being a human agent (5.19), his second escape was described in terms which leave no doubt that supernatural intervention is believed to have taken place (12.6-10).

Luke is no less interested in the personal qualities of Paul. After the healing of a cripple at Lystra both Paul and Barnabas received divine worship from the people, who exclaimed that gods in the form of men had come to them. Indeed the priest of Jupiter was on the point of making a sacrifice, when the apostles vigorously protested their mortal nature (14.8-13). Later in Malta Paul was believed to be a god because he had harmlessly shaken off a poisonous snake which from a bundle of firewood had fastened to his hand (28.2-6).²

At Philippi Paul in the name of Jesus exorcized an evil spirit which enabled a slave-girl to make predictions (16.16-18). He performed miracles of healing at Malta (28.9-10). Luke records miracles of an extraordinary kind at Ephesus. When even handkerchiefs and aprons which had been in contact with Paul's body were taken to the sick, they were healed and the spirits came out of them (19.11-12). One night in Iroas when Paul was speaking in an upstairs room, a sleepy young man fell from the open window to the ground. The apostle rushed down, threw himself upon him, embraced him, and said, "Don't worry, he is still alive" (20.9-12). It is interesting to notice here how Luke resists the temptation to describe a raising from the dead and is content with the simple diagnosis of the presence of life still in the body.³

Throughout his life Paul was under the providential care of God. Visions warned him of danger (22.17), or sent him on a new venture (16.9; 23.11), or simply reassured him of God's protection (18.9; 27.23-26).⁴

¹Herod, on the other hand, who accepted divine worship was struck down dead (12.20-23; cf. Josephus AJ 19.8, 2).

²At Lystra Paul and Barnabas are angry, but here the temper of the passage is almost one of good humour.

³Cf. Philostr. VA 4.45, where Philostratus hints that a spark of life was left in the "corose". Perhaps Paul's embrace (*συμπεριλαβών*) served some respiratory service similar to the modern "kiss-of-life" method used in first aid.

⁴It is possible that Luke is toning down a more miraculous survival, when he tells how at Lystra Paul was stoned, dragged out of the city and left for dead, but recovered when the believers gathered round him (14.12-20).

Of greatest importance for him, however, was the vision on the road to Damascus (9.1-30). Through the Holy Spirit the gift of prescience also belonged to Paul (20.22-23). He knew that he would not see his friends at Ephesus again (20.25, 38). He foresaw how catastrophe would result if the ship on which he was travelling left Fair Havens in Crete (27.9-16). His advice was ignored by the majority on board, but when it proved accurate Paul was able to predict that every life would be saved, only the ship would be lost in the storm (27.21-26).

These features together with the literary shape and form of Acts, including the "We-narrative" sections (16.10ff.; 20.5-21.17; 27.1-28.16), are paralleled in apocryphal and pagan writings of the *πράξεις* type. What would prove interesting, though full treatment cannot be given to it here, is the extent to which confirmation of this apostolic picture is given by New Testament epistolary literature. The "inspired" wisdom of an apostle is most certainly attested (2 Pet. 3.15; Eph. 3.2-6). Paul regards as "marks" of the true apostle *σημεία, τέρατα, δυνάμεις* (2 Cor. 12.12). He even reminds the Galatians that they received him as if he were an "angel of God" (Gal. 4.14). There were many who falsely claimed prophetic inspiration, against whom it became the duty of the apostles to warn the early churches (Gal. 1.6-9; 2 Thes. 2.1-4; 1 Tim. 1.3-4; 4.1-5; Tit. 1.10-16; 2 Pet. 2.1ff.; 1 Jn. 4.1).¹ But the importance of the prophetic gift was never underestimated. It is placed second in Paul's list of *χαρίσματα* (1 Cor. 12.28; cf. 14.1ff.),² a list which also includes wonder-workers, healers, and those who spoke in tongues of ecstasy. At the same time, however, it must be appreciated that Paul's personal conception of his own apostleship was that of a slave without any human dignity; it was Christ his master who worked wonders through him, who preached through him, and who won converts through him (1 Cor. 4.9 et passim; 2 Cor. 4.5 et passim).

¹The rival apostleship at Corinth has already been mentioned. See above, p. 254.

²It is true that the office of *προφήτης* involved proclaiming God's message as well as announcing future events (i.e. forthtelling and foretelling). But he was certainly an inspired person: his office was God-given. See the article in J. Hastings (ed.) Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh, 1902) s.v.; and in Liddell - Scott - Jones Lexicon s.v.

The Gospels

The birth of Jesus has often been compared to the births of wonder-children in Greek and Roman literature and legend. An annunciation is attested for Pythagoras, Plato, Alexander the Great, and Apollonius.¹ A similar role to that of Joseph in Mt. 1.25 is given to Aristo, who was told not to approach his wife until Plato had been born. The divine message or prophecy of the impending birth, which often included the naming of the child (Mt. 1.21; Lk. 2.21), is also a pagan motif used by both Virgil in his Fourth Eclogue and by Pindar in Isthmian Ode 6.² But the unparalleled chastity of Plato's mother is scarcely to be attributed to the early period when such stories might be formed.³ Other features of the infancy of Jesus are noteworthy. Matthew (2.11) records the adoration of magi, and in Luke (2.22-38) the baby is recognized in the Temple by Simeon, who along with Anna predicts his future glory to the amazement of his parents.

No one can doubt the reality of wonders for all peoples of the ancient world. A superficial comparison will show the mighty works of Jesus to match the wonders performed by pagan *θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι*. He possessed a perfect knowledge of all things (Jn. 2.24-25). Thus he read the character of the Samaritan woman at the well (Jn. 4.17-19), and he pronounced Peter's name by looking at his face (Jn. 1.42, cf. 47ff.). He often read the minds of his critics (Mt. 9.4, 16.8; Mk. 2.8; Lk. 6.8, 11.17; Jn. 16.19). Knowledge of the future was also in his possession, for he was able to foretell his own suffering, death and resurrection (Mt. 16.13ff., 17.22-23, 20.18-19, 26.2; Mk. 8.27-33; Lk. 18.31ff.; Jn. 12.3ff.). Similarly he predicted his betrayal (Mt. 26.21; Mk. 14.18; Lk. 22.21; Jn. 13.21), Peter's denial and the failing of the disciples in general (Mt. 26.31ff.; Mk. 14.27ff.; Lk. 22.31ff.; Jn. 13.36ff.). Warnings of dangers and persecutions in the future were also given (Mt. 10.16ff., 24-25; Mk. 13, cf. 16.15-18). John (18.9) points to the fulfilment of one of Jesus' prophecies.

¹ Iambli. Vit. Pyth. 5; Olympiodorus Vit. Plat. 1.10ff., cf. D. L. 3.2; Ps.-Callisthenes 1.4, 8, cf. Plut. Alex. 2.4; Philostr. VA 1.4. See also L. Bieler, op. cit., I pp. 24-27.

² Virgil Eclogues 4.4ff.; Pindar Isthm. 6.52ff.

³ L. Bieler, op. cit., I p.24, sees the influence of later times here. For the virgin birth of Augustus cf. Suet. Aug. 94.

The remedy for physical as well as mental disorders in the ancient world was very much a matter of spiritual cleansing: hence the common occurrence of exorcism and the emphasis in healings on the faith of the sufferer. The special power or authority to cast out evil spirits was granted to only a few exceptional psychic healers. The opponents of Jesus admitted that he performed exorcisms and that this required a greater than human power. Thus they attributed his success to Satan or to possession by some other evil spirit (Mt. 9.34; 12.24; Mk. 3.22; Lk. 11.15; Jn. 7.20; 8.52; 10.20).¹ Where details of healings are given--for these are so often related very simply and briefly--Jesus is believed to possess a superhuman power, a mana, which emanates from his body when touched by the sick (Mt. 9.20ff.; Mk. 5.25ff.; cf. 6.56; 7.31ff.; 8.22-26; Lk. 6.43ff.). Some believed that even by touching the edge of his cloak they would be healed (Mk. 6.56; Lk. 6.19). At the same time, however, both exorcisms and other healings could take place at a distance, if those who made the requests had sufficient faith (Mt. 15.21-28; Mk. 7.25-30; Jn. 4.43-54). But the crowning achievement of any healer's career must have been the raising to life of a dead person. Three separate incidents are related in which Jesus brings back from the dead Lazarus (Jn. 11), the widow of Nain's son (Lk. 7.11-17), and the daughter of Jairus (Mt. 9.18ff.; Mk. 5.21ff.; Lk. 8.40ff.).²

Other wonders such as the cursing of the fig-tree (Mt. 21.18-22; Mk. 11.12-14, 20), and the calming of the storm (Mt. 8.18, 23-26; Mk. 4.35-39; Lk. 8.22-24), display power over the natural world. These miracles of nature are performed not simply for their own sake; there is always added purpose. For example, Jesus walks over the water as much to test the disciples' faith--at first they believed they were seeing a ghost--as to reveal any superhuman power. This wonder is nonetheless immediately followed by the recognition of him as son of God (Mt. 14.22-36; Mk. 6.45-52; Jn. 6.16-21). Through the feeding of the five thousand (Mt. 14.13-21; Mk. 6.30-44; Lk. 9.10-17; Jn. 6.1-14), the copious catches of fish (Lk. 5.4-9; Jn. 21.4-11), the

¹Cf. the similar conclusion of Eusebius on Apollonius's miracles (c. Hieroclem 31). Luke (8.2) volunteers the information that Jesus drove seven devils out of Mary Magdalene.

²For the parallel between these passages and Philostr. VA 4.45 see below, pp. 270f.

fish with the silver coin in its mouth (Mt. 17.24-27), and the water changed into wine (Jn. 2.1-12) he is serving his friends who are in genuine need. For them he would use the powers which in the Temptation scene he refused to use for himself.

It is not necessary to understand the Transfiguration as an ancient counterpart to the spiritualists' séance, though Elijah and Moses are seen communicating with Jesus (Mt. 13.1-13; Mk. 9.1-13; Lk. 9.28-36). But if it was a mystical prayerful vision, it was also in Luke an exhausting psychical experience: the disciples were heavy with sleep, but they managed to stay awake (9.32). Here, as also at the baptism of Jesus (Mt. 3.16-17; Mk. 1.11; Lk. 3.21-22), a heavenly voice reveals the unique relationship in which as Son he stands to the Father. This, of course, is taken up by John and, to a lesser degree, by the synoptic writers. It goes without saying that Jesus is under divine providence and protection. Angels are said to watch over him (Mt. 4.6; Mk. 1.13; Lk. 4.9-10), and in Luke (4.30) his passing through the midst of a hostile crowd on the point of hurling him over a cliff can only be regarded as miraculous.

The performance of miracles was almost without exception accompanied by amazement and sometimes awe on the part of the crowd (Mk. 1.27; 5.20; 6.51; 7.37; Lk. 5.26; 8.25; 9.43; 11.14). At one place the people are filled with awe even to see him (Mk. 9.15). His reputation steadily increases (Mt. 4.24; 9.8, 31; Mk. 1.28; 5.20; Lk. 4.37; 5.15; 7.17), and he is at once recognized by people wherever he goes (Mt. 14.35; Mk. 15.39). Demons too confess that he is the son of God (Mt. 8.29; Mk. 3.11; 5.7; Lk. 8.28).

The teachings of Jesus are, though not exclusively, similar in content to those of pagan *θεῖον ἄνδρες*. Parallels of a general nature may be pointed out with regard to his thoughts on prayer, wealth, marriage, the good life, and so forth.¹ It is to be expected that since he had a close band of disciples he should set aside for them a more thorough form of instruction and teach the masses only by means of parables (Mt. 13.10-11; Mk. 4.11-12, 33-34; Lk. 8.9-10).

¹Parallels have been stated, perhaps too precisely, by I. Lévy, *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, pp. 307-26. Also cf. L. Bieler, *op. cit.*, I pp. 97-101. The assimilation of philosopher with physician (to take only one example) appears to have been a commonplace in the ancient world. Cf. Mt. 9.10-12, Mk. 2.15-17 and Lk. 5.29-32 with Plato *Gorgias* 521a, Dio Chrysost. *Or.* 8.5 and D.L. 6.6.

Thus in order to speak to the disciples about his death Jesus sets out upon a secret journey (Mk. 9.30). In Luke (10.1ff.) there is a further distinction between the twelve and an apostleship of seventy-two, who are dispatched in pairs to spread the good news in the neighbouring towns. But the twelve disciples retain a special status: they alone accompany Jesus in his final ordeal. A similar exoteric and esoteric doctrine was propounded by Pythagoras and Apollonius.¹ It remains to comment on the astonishment of all who listened to Jesus' words (Mk. 1.27; 6.2; 11.18; 12.17; Lk. 4.22; cf. Acts 13.12). He was unlike other teachers, for he taught with authority (Mt. 7.29; Mk. 1.22; Lk. 4.32; Jn. 7.46). When only twelve years old he amazed learned teachers in the Temple (Lk. 2.47). Moreover, Pilate marvelled even at his refusal to speak (Mk. 15.5).

It seems to be inevitable that a *Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* should encounter opposition to his mission. Jesus, who was no exception to this (Mt. 12.14; 19.3ff.; 21.23ff.; 22-23; Mk. 10.11; Lk. 20-21; Jn. 5.10-18; 11.45-57), though usually able to silence his adversaries, was eventually arrested and brought to trial. This led to the mockery and ridicule which he had to endure from those who failed to recognize his superior qualities (Mt. 26.67-68; 27.27-31, 39-44; Mk. 14.65; 15.16-20, 29-32; Lk. 22.62-65; 23.35-37; Jn. 19.1-3). He was even accused of being an impostor (*πλάγιος* Mt. 27.63, cf. Jn. 7.12).²

It has been seen that controversy nearly always surrounded the nature of the *Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. Sometimes it is the question of a genuinely inspired life or charlatanry. This is expressed for Jesus in Jn. 7.12-13, cf. 40-44. Again, just as the Crotoniates could not decide whether Pythagoras was Apollo, Paeon, or a lunar demon (Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 30), so the people of Palestine asked the questions, "Who is this?", "What sort of man is he?", "What new teaching is this?" (Mt. 8.27; 13.54; 21.10-11; Mk. 1.27; 4.41; 6.1-6, 14-16; Lk. 4.36; 5.21; 7.49; 8.25; 9.9). Similarly, they could not decide whether Jesus was

¹Damis was often excluded from Apollonius's interviews with important people (*VA* 1.26; 3.12ff.; 5.10). Pythagoras taught the older and busier men by precepts only, and he reserved his full doctrine for the young men who had more time to study (Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 88).

²Cf. the earlier accusation of casting out devils by means of devils, which amounts to calling Jesus a sorcerer. See above, p. 259.

John the Baptist come back to life, Elijah, or some other prophet. Full recognition is usually reserved for a close disciple. Peter's confession "You are the Christ" (Mt. 16.13ff.; Mk. 8.27ff.; Lk. 9.18ff.) may correspond to the assertion of Abaris that Pythagoras was the Hyperborean Apollo (Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 91) and the confession of Damis in prison that Apollonius was truly a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* (VA 7.38).

The personal claim of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* to be divine is no less important than the recognition of his divinity by others. The alleged assertion of Jesus to be "son of God" (Mt. 27.43, cf. 54) goes no further than any other claim for a divine man. But the more detailed statements, especially in John, about his unique relationship with the Father have, to my knowledge, no exact parallel in pagan literature. The significance given in the New Testament to Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension is similarly unique. Indeed where non-Christian literature does present what appears to be death followed by resurrection and ascension--in the traditions on Peregrinus and Apollonius--the idea is ridiculed by Lucian and suppressed by Philostratus. Both may have believed it alien to the refined taste of their reading public.¹

Christology and the Hellenistic Divine Man

It will have become obvious that the Christian presentation of Jesus and the apostles bears striking similarities to the pagan conception of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. There were also essential differences which these similarities must not allow to become obscure. The purpose of this final section is to examine in greater depth the parallels (and the contrasts) in Christian and Hellenistic conceptions of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* category.

¹The idea of resurrection was evidently not attractive to the Athenians of Paul's day (Acts 17.32). The word which the Graeco-Roman world would find most naturally appropriate for the alleged description of such an event is *θαύμα*. The theory of transmigration and the various journeys to Hades are, of course, quite different. L. Bieler, *op. cit.*, I p. 48, is therefore wrong if under the heading of Resurrection he is classifying Pythagoras, Epimenides and Zalmoxis together with Christ.

However, the sympathy of nature with a dying *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* (Mt. 27.51-53; Lk. 23.44) is paralleled in Virgil *Georgics* 1.461ff. for the death of Julius Caesar.

Titles of Christ

First there is the question of the derivation of specific titles of Christ. The origin of the names *κύριος*, *σωτήρ*, *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* for Jesus has long been a matter of dispute. It is believed by some that, although the meaning in each case is radically altered, the Christian concepts derive from the Graeco-Roman world.

Something has already been said about *κύριος* and *σωτήρ* as terms of honour for the worship of rulers. They have little to do with the popular religious conception of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.¹ The third title, however, may be different. Although men like Pythagoras and Apollonius were not called "lord" or "saviour" (names reserved for political rulers), they were certainly believed by some to be "sons of God", if only on account of the legends of their miraculous births. But neither Pythagoras nor Apollonius are regularly called *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*; instead the epithets *θεῖος*, *δαμόνιος*, *θεσπέσιος*, *κρείττων ἀνθρώπου*, κτλ. are used. For evidence in the Graeco-Roman world for the title "son of God" we must turn to ruler-worship. There we find the imperial title *divi filius* first used of Augustus and earlier for the Ptolemies the counterparts *a dis genitus*, *filius Isis et Osiris*, *υἱὸς τοῦ Ἡλίου*, *θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεᾶς*.²

But ruler-worship and popular religion, though there may have been points of contact between the two, were essentially different phenomena. The ruler as *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* was not also *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. The cult-title lacked real religious significance. To worship a

¹See above, pp.67ff. It is nevertheless quite probable that when Thomas is reported to have addressed the risen Christ as "My Lord and my God", there is an intended allusion to Domitian's adopted title *Dominus et Deus* (Jn. 20.28; cf. Suet. *Dom.* 13).

²See V. Taylor, *The Name of Jesus* (London, 1953), p. 54 and the references there. See also above, p. 59. Apollonius is believed by some to be the son of Zeus Orkios (*VA* 1.6), but this is not known as a cult-title.

Celsus (Origen *c. Celsum* 7.8f.) says that he is tired of hearing about men who go throughout the temples and cities proclaiming that "I am god, or god's son, or godlike; the end of the world is nigh; but I will save men who worship me; others will perish". As is clear from the last three-quarters of the quotation, Celsus's main object of attack is Christianity, and the title "god's son" will, no doubt, refer primarily, perhaps only, to Jesus.

king or emperor as son of god was politically expedient for almost everyone; few appear to have displayed signs of genuine belief or devotion.¹ To state, therefore, that the Christian concept of son of God derives from the Graeco-Roman concept of divine man is to confuse two basically different ideas.² At the same time, the mythological son of god may be seen as quite separate from the Christian concept. Jesus was not, like Heracles, the physical offspring of a Zeus or Apollo who had slept with his mother. He was conceived in no ordinary manner through the life-force of the Spirit (Mt. 1.18; Lk. 1.35).

For Jesus the title son of God was linked to the messianic role: he is to be the new Moses. Demons thus recognize him as *ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ* (Mk. 1.24; Lk. 4.34).³ It is also connected with his specific task of suffering. He is son of God not as thaumaturge but as one "obedient even unto death". Peter's confession is therefore followed immediately by a prediction of future suffering (Mt. 16.16ff.; Mk. 8.29ff.; Lk. 9.20ff.), and the centurion's confession comes immediately after death on the cross (Mt. 27.54; Mk. 15.39).⁴ If anything, the Old Testament concept of son of God, though not identical, would be a more likely source of influence.⁵ Moreover, it is a mistake to believe that the title for Christ was a late one which was not known to the original Palestinian church. When Paul speaks of God's son in, for example, I Thes. 1.9ff. he is not coining a new phrase. The idea is obviously rooted in primitive tradition and it has been demonstrated (against the German scholars' hypothesis)

¹ See above, pp. 70ff. As with *σωτήρ*, it is only in its later application to mystery-cults that it acquires religious meaning.

² For this theory see W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen, 1913), pp. 52-57; G. P. Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes* (Göttingen, 1916); R. Bultman, *The Theology of the New Testament*, Eng. transl. K. Grobel (2 vols. S.C.M. London, 1952), I pp. 128-33. The whole question is discussed by R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (London, 1965), pp. 68ff., and by O. Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament*, Eng. transl. (London, 1959), pp. 270ff. See also F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (Göttingen, 1963).

³ F. Hahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 295ff.

⁴ O. Cullmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 277f.

⁵ O. Cullman, *op. cit.*, pp. 272-75. See also F. Hahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 280ff.

that Jesus did speak of himself as the son of God in a pre-eminent sense.¹ Both Paul and the gospel writers were making use of this tradition.

Pythagoras and Christ

To turn now to specific derivation of another kind, there is the thesis of Isodore Lévy.² In his view the lost legend of Pythagoras, preserved only in disconnected fragments by Iamblichus and Porphyry, was the prototype of all such legends which came after it. So not only was Philostratus's Life of Apollonius based on Pythagorean traditions but the Christian gospels also were ultimately derived from them. They were, naturally, transformed as they passed into Jewish culture.

Here are endless possibilities for anyone with imaginative ingenuity. Lévy's conclusions are, at the very least, extreme. Similarities of a general nature are to be expected in the lives of all authoritative teachers or founders of religion so long as we accept the clear recognition in the ancient world of the demonic or pneumatic personality. At most the similarities reveal the existence of a common fund of stock features which came to be expected in the descriptions of similar personality types. Many of these, like the preaching at Capernaum (Mk. 1.21-28; Lk. 4.31-37) and the discourse at Croton (Iamblichus Vit. Pyth. 57), the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Mt. 13.53-58; Mk. 6.1-6; Lk. 4.16-30) and the indifference of the Samians to Pythagoras' philosophy (Iambl. 20, 28), Jesus' teaching about family life (Lk. 9.61-62) and the Crotoniates who "did not return to their homes" (Iambl. 30, 257), are too vague to warrant serious consideration.³ For when one decides upon fixed

¹V. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 55-59; O. Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 275-290; F. Hahn, op. cit., pp. 280ff. That all true Christians are to become sons or children of God (Rom. 8.15; Gal. 3.26; Philipp. 2.15; 1 Jn. 3.1) is, of course, primarily a Jewish idea based on Old Testament literature. Cf. Deut. 32; 14.1; Ps. 2.7; Ho. 1.10, etc.

²I. Lévy, Recherches sur les Sources de la Légende de Pythagore; idem, La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine.

³Lévy, Légende de Pythagore, pp. 301f., 304f., 323. It is also only natural that in content the moral teaching of Jesus and Pythagoras will contain resemblances of a general nature. See above, pp. 260f.

patterns or categories which help to promote the understanding of the life of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, it is inevitable that for different *θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι* the details under each category will bear some resemblance one to another. A further problem with Pythagoras and the gospels is the uncertain date of much of the material in Porphyry and Iamblichus; the borrowing could be on their part.¹ Indeed Lévy's rather tenuous case begins to break down when in order to fill gaps in the known legend of Pythagoras he has to refer to non-Pythagorean sources, especially Philostratus's Life of Apollonius. Clearly if there was evidence of borrowing between the gospel writers and Philostratus, the latter, on chronological grounds, should bear the responsibility for it.²

Apollonius of Tyana and Christ

While the parallels with Pythagoras are hazardous, a comparison between the gospels and Philostratus is more likely to produce positive results. A parallel between the lives of Christ and Apollonius of Tyana was drawn in the ancient world by Hierocles (c. A.D. 305);³ and despite Eusebius's forceful assertion of the contrast between the two (contra Hieroclem 4) no one can fail to see both general and specific similarities in their stories.

This, of course, can be taken too far as well as ignored. In the seventeenth century G. Naudé in a vindication of all the famous men who had falsely been accused of sorcery left only Apollonius without a defence.⁴ Drawing a number of comparisons, plausible

¹An example may be the calming of the storm in Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 135, Porph. Vit. Pyth. 29 and the idea that small children are especially favoured of the gods in Iambl. Vit. Pyth. 51-53.

²References compiled by I. Lévy are not without some value. It is interesting to discover in Sextus Empiricus (p. 605, 23 Becker) the expression *οὐδὲ ὁ τυφλὸς τὸν τυφλὸν ὀδηγεῖν (δύναται)*, or that the ideas on humble sacrifice in Porphyry De Abst. 2.15-17 are similar to the teachings of Jesus in Mk. 12.41, Lk. 21.1, and so forth.

³See above, ch. VII pp.197ff.

⁴G. Naudé, Apologie pour Tous les Grands Hommes qui ont été Faussement Soupçonnez de Magie (Paris, 1625). See E. M. Butler, The Myth of the Magus, pp. 64f.

enough to anyone who had never read Philostratus, Nauré saw him as an inferior imitation of Christ, who probably did not even exist. The annunciation, the raising of the dead girl, the "resurrection" appearance at Dicaearchia, and the ascension are not unreasonably listed; perhaps even the singing swans are comparable to the herald angels.¹ It is ludicrous, however, to see veiled in the meteor of VA 1.5 the star of Bethlehem, in the letters from emperors the homage of the wise men, in the misbehaving eunuch of VA 1.36 the woman taken in adultery, in the hobgoblin of VA 2.4 the Temptation of Jesus, or in the youthful talks at Aegae the young Jesus in the Temple. Parallels as exact as these ask a good deal more of the imagination than a simple reading of the relevant sources would supply.²

It may be less incorrect to maintain that the parallel is striking but on general lines only. Common to both Christ and Apollonius are the miracles, the moral teachings, the persecution, the exalted character, and so forth. But here, as with the comparison of details, caution is needed. Two parallel situations, particular or general, set side by side are never satisfactorily explained when one is declared dependent on the other. If in other cultures concepts equivalent to the Graeco-Roman *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* are to be found--for example the Hindu avatara, the Jewish *ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ*, the Siberian shaman, the bodhisattva of Buddhism, the Christian saint--similar modes of behaviour will inevitably be displayed by most, if not all, of them; and characteristic portrayals of each, though described independently, will conform to a basic pattern that can be clearly defined. Thus in the ancient world it is predictable, though by no means always determinable, that the same type of personality will, within the limits imposed by the conditions of his environment, perform broadly similar feats and elicit comparable responses.

To believe that Apollonius was sent to Crete on account of a vision (4.34) because Paul was similarly sent to Macedonia (Acts 16.8-10), or that he ignored the warnings of danger from his friends (1.18, etc.) because Jesus did likewise (Mt. 16.21f., etc.), or, more generally,

¹There are differences of detail: the swans greeted the mother at the moment of birth, the angels appeared after the birth to shepherds in the fields.

²Reference to the so-called Apollonians (VA 8.21) will recall not the term Christian but, of course, Pythagorean.

to believe in the ridicule and persecution of Apollonius only because Jesus suffered the same betrays a failure to comprehend this important psychological truth. As religious teachers with extraordinary power and authority, both Apollonius and Christ in their lives follow what is essentially the same pattern. Apollonius was to the pagans a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, Jesus was to the Christians the Messiah. Inevitably, there will be basic differences in the content of their message and in the circumstances of their lives. But in so far as they both promulgated a spiritual message to mankind it is natural that together they met the fierce opposition of a materialistic world; in so far as both possessed psychic powers it is to be expected that they are both called upon to heal psychic disorders.¹ As one eighteenth-century critic has put it, "Philostratus said nothing more in the Life of Apollonius than he would have said if there had been no Christians in the world".²

However, to state the case thus is to ignore both incidents and words in Philostratus which bear fairly close resemblance to similar incidents or words in the gospels. Admittedly, these are few in number; yet their existence does make it less easy to reject altogether the possibility of utilization on the part of one author. Again, it should be remembered, it is only the borrowing of detached details, and not the adoption of an entire concept, that is in question. Both the Christian writers and Philostratus needed to look only to their own respective culture and literature for a version of the universal concept of Übermensch.³

Nowhere does linguistic evidence prove direct borrowing. The same Greek word is used in both the New Testament and Philostratus

.....

¹The expulsion of evil spirits (believed by F. C. Baur to be a Jewish idea) was a principal duty for the thaumaturge in all parts of the ancient world. Stock examples for comparison with Philostratus and the New Testament are Josephus AJ 8.2, 5 (45-48); Lucian Philopseudes 16, cf. 10. Possession was no new idea to the Greek world with its Sibyls, Pythian prophetesses and Bacchic Maenads.

²J. M. Robertson, Pagan Christs (London, 1911), p. 278, quoting the words of De la Roche as cited by his contemporary, N. Lardner, Works (1835) vi. 489ff.

³For Philostratus's attitude towards Christianity see above, ch. VII p. 197f.

for the expression "take heart", "be of good cheer":

θάραξε	Mt. 9.22; Mk. 10.49; Acts 23.11.	<u>VA</u> 3.38.
θαράξετε	Mk. 6.50; Jn. 16.33.	<u>VA</u> 4.10, 34.
θάραξε	—	<u>VA</u> 7.21, 23, 38; 8.23.
θαράξετε	—	<u>VA</u> 8.26.
θαράξειν	—	<u>VA</u> 6.5; 7.21; 8.15.

It cannot be maintained, however, that Philostratus introduced *θάραξε* directly from Christian literature and then in the course of writing his books returned to the normal Attic spelling *θάραξε*. This sort of Hellenistic laxity occurs regularly in the work. In other contexts Philostratus uses indiscriminately the verbs *θαράξειν* (VA 1.12, 15; 5.21, 29, 38, 43; 6.11; 7.18, 26, 28, 42; 8.31) and *θαράξετε* (VA 3.44; 4.38; 6.43; 7.14). In fact *θάραξε*, attested also as an expression of comfort in Lucian *Philopseudes* 11, will have been no less a platitude in Greek than in English the phrase "cheer up".

In the account of Menippus and the vampire at Corinth (VA 4.25) the creature begs Apollonius not to torture it (*βαδανίσειν*). The same Greek word is used in the gospel narratives of the Gadarene (or Gerasene) demoniacs (Mt. 8.29; Mk. 5.7; Lk. 8.28). Apollonius is implored not to compel the vampire to confess what it was; in two of the three gospels Jesus asks the demon its name (Mk. 5.9; Lk. 8.30). However, neither the word for torture, much less the idea, is necessarily borrowed by Philostratus. It would appear that the recognition of demons and other supernatural fiends by a holy man was almost invariably accompanied by a fit of torture. In VA 4.20 when Apollonius detected an evil spirit (*εἰδωλον*) in a young man, it "began to utter shouts of fear and anger such as are heard from men being branded or stretched on the rack".¹ Confessions from demons may have been no less frequent an occurrence in the many stories told.

Apollonius's cleansing in Egypt of a suppliant's blood-guilt (VA 6.5, cf. 3) has little to do with Jesus' statement to a cripple

¹The shrieking of a supernatural creature is commonly attested. Cf. VA 2.4 (*τετραγός*) with the various forms of *κράζειν* in the New Testament (Mk. 1.23; 5.5; 9.26; Lk. 4.33; 8.28; 9.39). For *βαδανίσειν* in Philostratus cf. also VA 1.21, 33; 5.24; 7.14; and cf. *βάδανος* (4.37).

that his sins are forgiven (Mt. 9.2ff.; Mk. 2.5ff.; Lk. 5.20ff.). But the command to go home, or to return to human habitation, is shared. The mystical saying that Brahmins "live on earth, yet not on it" (VA 3.15) may recall Jesus' emphatic denial to be "of the world" (Jn. 8.23; 15.19; 17.4, 16) and the apostles' abhorrence of worldly things (Rom. 12.2; 1 Jn. 2.15ff.). Certainly, Jesus' statement "no one is good except God alone" (Mk. 10.18; Lk. 18.19) has its parallel in VA 3.18 where Iarchus, asked why the Indian sages thought of themselves as gods, replies "because we are good men". And the rebuke of Apollonius to a young encomiast who is not sure that he can adequately praise his father, whom he knows like himself, and yet endeavours to praise Zeus, father and creator of all things (VA 4.30), may recall the New Testament advice that no one who does not love his brother, whom he has seen, can love God, whom he has not seen (1 Jn. 4.20-21). The formula remains the same; love has simply been replaced by praise.

Most, if not all, of the parallels related already can be explained in terms of coincidence.¹ In a number of places, however, the more basic ingredients of the narratives are suspiciously analogous. The raising of a dead girl at Rome (VA 4.45) seems at first sight to correspond closely to Luke's story of the widow of Nain's son (Lk. 7.11ff.). In both accounts a funeral procession attended by large crowds is halted, the corpse is touched, and words are uttered over the body (a secret spell by Apollonius, a clear command by Jesus). But in Philostratus a young bride of consular family, not a man, lies on the funeral bier, and this will call to mind the raising of Jairus's daughter (Mt. 9.18ff.; Mk. 5.39ff.). Moreover, after the mysterious whisperings Apollonius "wakes the girl from apparent death" (ἀφύπνισε τὴν κόρην τοῦ δοκούτος θανάτου); and in the gospels Jesus insists that the young girl and Lazarus are only asleep (Mt. 9.24; Mk. 5.39; Jn. 11.11), and his word of command usually is "wake up" (Mt. 9.25; Mk. 5.41; Lk. 7.14; cf. Jn. 21.14).

It is tempting to see Philostratus's account as an enlarged version of some less well authenticated story about Apollonius and to believe that from his vague knowledge of the gospels he amalgamated

¹The demoniac, the lame man, the blind man, the paralytic and the others cured in India among the Brahmins were patients of Iarchus not Apollonius (VA 3.38-40).

into one incident various elements from the different stories to be found there. But if he needed a source, Philostratus already had one in Graeco-Roman literature. The elder Pliny (HN 26.3, 8) records to the fama of the Bithynian doctor, Asclepiades (1st cent. B.C.), the saving from flames of a corpse that had not yet died.¹ Writing a century later, Apuleius provides the details of this incident (Florida 4.9, 19).² As the famous doctor was returning from his villa to the city, he was passed by a funeral cortège. Unable to discover any details from the procession, he approached the bier, looked at the man, examined him for certain signs, handled the body, and saw that life was still in him. With difficulty (for they were all beneficiaries!) he persuaded the procession to turn back, and at his home he revived the man by means of certain drugs.

Some of the facts differ from Philostratus, but the situation is the same. I find it difficult, however, to conclude with Jessen³ that the story has been transferred from the lesser-known Asclepiades to the more illustrious Apollonius, whose journeys equalled those of the sons of Asclepius (VA 6.35). An incident that appears to have been well known for nearly two hundred years could hardly be borrowed without risk of confutation. It is surely not unreasonable to expect that if such a story were told of the less important Asclepiades, similar stories will have been in circulation about Apollonius, who was a healer albeit of a different order. In the ancient world many an unfortunate "corpse" will through ignorance have been burnt (or buried) alive, for only a handful of highly skilled diagnosticians could recognize what today is called coma and stupor.⁴ Apollonius's initiation in the Asclepieion at Aegae may well have included the transmission of secrets such as these.⁵

¹Pliny's lack of detail may mean that the story was well known in his day.

²The Florida was written some time after the Apologia (A.D. 156-58). Apuleius does not name his source.

³J. Jessen, Apollonius von Tyana, p. 19.

⁴For a similar marvel cf. D. L. 8.59 (of Empedocles).

⁵Conversely, if a model were required for the Christian writers, it would surely be 1 Kings 17.17-23; 2 Kings 4.31-37.

For another story told about two different persons in two different places cf. Pliny Ep. 7.27 (Athenodorus at Athens) with Lucian Philopseudes 29 (Arignotus at Corinth).

The description of Apollonius's appearance to his two friends at Dicaearchia after triumphantly leaving the court of Domitian contains closer and more remarkable parallels to events in the gospels concerning the appearances of the risen Jesus. Before going to face Domitian, Apollonius sends Damis on to Dicaearchia, where he shall see him appear (ἐπιφάνεντα γὰρ με ἔκει ὄψει VA 7.41¹). Damis asks, "Alive, or how?", and Apollonius replies with laughter, "To my way of thinking, alive, but as you will believe, restored to life from the dead (ἀναβεβιωκότα² --ibid.)". Now the meeting takes place in a nymphs' cave on the sea-shore; there are two disciples present, for Damis has been joined by Demetrius; and they are talking of Apollonius as if they will never see him alive again (VA 8.11-12). Apollonius, who is already present in the cave (a point stressed by Philostratus), takes his cue from their sad conversation and says, "You shall see him, in fact you already have". "Alive?" asks Demetrius. Then Apollonius extends his hand and says, "Take hold of me, and if I escape your grasp I am a ghost (εἶδωλον) come to you from Persephone...But if I should resist your touch, convince Damis also that I am alive and have not lost my body". They could no longer disbelieve (ἀπιστεῖν --ibid.).

A narrative has been presented into which we may care to read, rightly or wrongly, not a few literary echoes of the New Testament. Jesus before and after his resurrection names Galilee as the place where his disciples are to expect him (Mt. 26.32; 28.7, 10, 16; Mk. 14.28; 16.7). He appears to them on the shore of the Sea of Galilee (Lake of Tiberias--Jn. 21.1ff.), and on a different occasion to two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Lk. 24.13). Thomas, to whose touch Jesus offers his hand and side (Jn. 20.27; cf. Lk. 24.39), is rebuked for lack of belief (καὶ μὴ γίνου ἀπίστος ἀλλὰ πιστός -- Jn. 20.27), and all the disciples in Luke 24.36-40 believed at first that they were looking at a ghost (πνεῦμα).³ The concordance of detail is more than incidental. But the nature of the connection that exists between Philostratus and the gospels may be no more than

¹Cf. φαίνω (Mk. 16.9); φανερώω (Mk. 16.12, 14; Jn. 21.1, 14).

²The usual word in the New Testament is ἠγέρθη (Mt. 28.6; Mk. 16.16; Lk. 24.34), but cf. ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν (Lk. 24.46; Jn. 20.9).

³All this makes the observation that Damis arrived at Dicaearchia on the third day (τρίτῃς --VA 7.41) the more noteworthy.

the subconscious recollection of similar events in Christian literature by one who was writing about a man whom he believed to belong in the same category as Christ. There need be no deliberate attempt to copy. Indeed Philostratus is careful to stress the corporeality of Apollonius: he had not died.

The "ascension" of Apollonius (VA 8.30) would be nothing new to the Graeco-Roman world. In mythology various heroes were carried off to the Isles of the Blest, and men like Heracles or Romulus were rewarded for the distinction of their lives by admittance to heaven. Empedocles on Mt. Etna had tried to simulate such an ascension; one is assigned by Lucian to Peregrinus.¹

Some German scholars have thought that concealed in the last books of Philostratus is an earlier tradition according to which Apollonius died, made the journey to Hades, and returned back to life.² This Philostratus will have played down in order, presumably, to remove from his hero any suspicion of trickery. If then, as Jessen believed, the appearance at Dicaearchia was originally a return from the underworld, Philostratus suppressed the unwanted element in his version so that when Apollonius was asked to explain his journey thither (VA 8.12), his answer became, "Believe whatever you like...so long as you ascribe it to a god (i.e. not by sorcery)". That pre-Philostratean traditions did contain a Catabasis is quite feasible. There was in the region of Dicaearchia a ianua Orphi (at Cumae--Lucretius 6.747ff.; Virg. Aen. 6.1-264). And what could be more natural than for Apollonius to follow in the footsteps of Pythagoras, in whose legend a Catabasis was probably an early feature (D.L. 8.21, citing Hieronymus).³ This could certainly lie behind the descent of Trophonius's cave in Lebaidea (VA 8.19), which on the admission of Philostratus was a local account and perhaps in need of modification. c/

Reitzenstein read a great deal more between the lines. Philostratus openly states that there were two contrasting versions of the trial of Apollonius. There was his own version of imprisonment, trial,

¹Homer Od. 4.561-69; Ovid Met. 9.299ff.; Livy 1.16; D.L. 8.68; Lucian Peregrinus 39.

²J. Jessen, op. cit., p. 28; R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, pp. 46ff.

³See above, pp. 30f.

short interrogation and acquittal; there existed also a malicious perversion of the facts, which he condemned (VA 7.35). According to this, Apollonius first made his defence and was then imprisoned and shorn. He gained his freedom by means of a cringing letter to Domitian, and afterwards, presumably, lived in obscurity.¹ Reitzenstein adds a third account. This included a well set-out Apology which was actually delivered. Philostratus, he says, could not resist incorporating this Apology into his own work, although it was out of place there and would need to undergo some alteration. He argues that in this version after the speech was delivered, Apollonius (like Socrates) was condemned to death. For the sequel, if not the gospels themselves, the beliefs of the Christians were then taken into account, and Apollonius died a martyr's death (see 8.15)² only later to return from the dead to the land of the living. Thus when he arrived in Olympia (8.15) news was carried through the Greek world "that Apollonius was alive".

Whether such a martyrium existed remains for ever uncertain. We do know that Philostratus was not disposed to write in that fashion. The idea of martyrdom was not yet accorded the honour and glory which it was later to gain.³ The Graeco-Roman θεός άνθρωπος does not die; he overcomes the threat of death. When he leaves the world, it is in a mysterious manner that can only be hinted at, not revealed to his friends. Furthermore it is of his own choosing, at a time when he himself has made up his mind that his presence on earth is no longer required. To depart, return, and finally depart (without purpose) would deprive the departure of its mystery and importance.

In summary, the parallel between Apollonius and Christ is one of general situation rather than detail, and as such it rules out any attempt at imitation on a large scale. However, one or two items where details do appear similar would suggest a definite acquaintance

¹The apologetic of VA 7.35 was, no doubt, directed against Moeragenes or the views which he represented.

²Is this what was originally meant by Philostratus's reference (8.15) to "rumours that Apollonius had been burnt alive, that he had been dragged about still living with hooks fixed in his neck, or thrown into a pit or into the sea"?

³Lucian's ridicule of Peregrinus may be taken as the accepted view of martyrdom.

of Philostratus with Christian writings and the sub-conscious transference of isolated particulars from the stories of Jesus to stories which involved Apollonius in similar situations.

It is not my purpose to point out (other than indirectly) the very clear contrast between Apollonius and Christ. This has been done by Eusebius and others in the ancient world, and by Baur and Reville in more recent times.¹ There are differences of character, differences of teaching, and more fundamental differences in the nature of what each was believed to represent. At the same time, however, Philostratus and the Christian writers together faced the problem of writing about someone who in their view was far more than a common thaumaturge. Jesus, for example, was more important than Simon Magus (Acts 8.9ff.), or Agabus the prophet (*ibid.* 21.10-14), though many of his powers were shared by other wonder-workers of that age. The worker of wonders could be a wizard, and the cause of his mysterious powers could be trickery. The New Testament was therefore more concerned with the unique Christological context of Jesus' life,² just as Philostratus took necessary pains to show Apollonius as a Pythagorean philosopher as well as thaumaturge.

The progression seems to be γόης — θαυματουργός — θεός άνήρ . Both Apollonius and Jesus are comparable in those elements which are properly called thaumaturgic. What distinguishes them from other thaumaturges, and indeed from one another, is the Pythagorean philosophy in the case of Apollonius and the fulfilment of messianic prophecy in the case of Jesus. This perhaps better than anything else displays the indefinite and undetermined nature of the concept θεός άνήρ in the ancient world. It is a nebulous term which, if applied correctly to Apollonius, will not be applied in precisely the same manner to Christ, and vice-versa. Both cannot be θεοί άνδρες together without the term taking on an entirely different significance in either application; the only common factor is that both were seen to be on a higher plane than that of a thaumaturge.

¹Eusebius *c. Hieroclem* 4; cf. F. C. Baur, *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus*, pp. 150ff.; A. Reville, *Apollonius of Tyana*, p. 48. See also above, p. 263.

²In apocryphal works the reverse is true: Jesus and the apostles are there described often as thaumaturges capable of producing wonder upon wonder without end.

This will not mean that Philostratus could not have seen any parallel between Apollonius and Christ. He could easily have failed to perceive the essential contrast while noting only the general similarity of type, so that for him both Apollonius and Christ were genuine *θεῶν ἄνδρες*. Conversely, the New Testament writers could hardly ignore the language, concepts and imagery of their day. The conception of the *θεῶν ἄνθρωπος* as held by Philostratus is therefore traceable in the gospels. But, like Paul for his theology, they made use of inherited modes of thought without sacrificing what was characteristic of the new revelation in Christ.¹ There was nothing of the syncretism or crudity of the second-century apocryphal literature, whose authors were perhaps too far removed from the founder of their faith to remain firm. On account of the unique personage about whom they were writing the canonical writers were able to infuse a new meaning into what were probably well-established forms.

¹See A. F. Findlay, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

CONCLUSION

The worship or identification of a human being as a god was no difficult problem for the Graeco-Roman mind. Anthropomorphic polytheism may well appear to have been founded on such a principle. Without the limitations of a monotheistic system and the insuperable barrier between man and god that this entails, the Greeks could conceive of several degrees of divinity. For them the gods were no more than an extension of man and the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* as a hybrid species was, despite the caution of Herodotus and Pindar, far more than just a formal possibility.

Perhaps the idea owed some part of its origin to the myth of the Golden Age and Hesiod's first generation of mortals who lived like gods and were dear to the gods (Works and Days ll. 109-20). Less remote was the age of demi-gods, Hesiod's *ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος* (ibid. l. 159), from among which Heracles had on earth grown into a god. Divine sonship from the beginning may seem an unfair advantage over other men. Yet in the archaic age sibyls, seers and shaman-like medicine-men were credited with divine status. This was, of course, before a measure of civilization had diminished the extreme religiosity of the age.

Among the personalities of the sixth century Thales, Solon and Pherecydes were said to have predicted events, but no further legend depicted any of these as divine. Clearly Pythagoras and, later, Empedocles must have possessed extraordinary characters to be singled out from other wise men and assigned the legends of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. With these two the concept begins to take on a more distinct shape and the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* emerges as an outstanding philosopher-scientist who searches for truths with all the fervour of a religious mystic and, having found them, feels divinely obliged to impart his inspiration to the rest of mankind. At this early stage the attainment of supreme wisdom has as an almost necessary corollary the possession of super-human power, and a wonder-working tradition can be traced back to the fourth and fifth centuries for Empedocles and Pythagoras. A certain

amount of showmanship (in the style of the medicine-man) is attested for Empedocles. The Pythagorean legend, which went underground in the third and second centuries was given greater cohesion and amplification in the third century A.D.

A similar mode of life may be traced for Socrates who was in many ways an anachronism in fifth-century Athens. Spectacular showmanship and gross magical qualities form hardly any part of his tradition; thanks mainly to Plato, who by writing about Socrates before any extensive oral legend had been allowed to develop was able to influence all later conceptions of him. Greater importance is given to the divine mission of Socrates the inquisitive gad-fly. Later interpretations of the *δαίμόνιον*, by Plutarch and Apuleius for example, are manifestly more supernatural than Plato's. However, even in the fifth century Aristophanes preserves the picture of a showman-scientist with a vast stock of esoteric knowledge for sale.

The saintly standing of these three early *θεῖοι ἄνδρες* determined a great part of the concept for later centuries. Philostratus's Apollonius of Tyana certainly seems to enjoy the composite characteristics of supreme wisdom (Socrates), religious fervour (Pythagoras), and solemn exhibitionism (Empedocles).

The notion of a "godsend" or a man who stood in a special relationship to a god found favour with Cyrus the Elder who, for what are usually considered to be political reasons, assumed the role of servant of Yahweh. A *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* was much more than that. But Xenophon's ideal portrait of Cyrus used some features which later became established for the regular portrait of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.

With Alexander the Great one sees for the first time the extraordinary complexity and ambiguity that can often invest the personality of a godlike man. Such is the nature of this degree of divinity half-way between man and god that anyone who claimed to belong to that class would at the same time as worship attract suspicion and even hostility from those not prepared to believe in his divinity. Alexander, then, was regarded variously as some kind of god or (more lastingly) as a megalomaniac. The motives for his divine pretensions, though they will always be uncertain, could have been misunderstood. The pretensions themselves must account for much of the hostile tradition that has survived in biographical and historical forms. The favourable tradition had been turned into romantic legend as early as the second century B.C. We do, however, know that few Greeks took Alexander's divinity seriously - after his death!

If Alexander had outstripped all other human beings, it can be no surprise that his successors were also believed to be higher than human. But to call a Ptolemy or a Seleucus god, whatever this may have meant earlier to Alexander, was in their day quite different from calling Heracles or Empedocles a god. For religious language had become totally devoid of sentiment and divine worship was very much a formal expression of gratitude or a politically expedient gesture. There was no real divine identification for these men, who were worshipped not as gods but instead of gods. It was not that they had bridged the gap between man and god; for them the gap had been obliterated.

One can never know with certainty how the common people treated their new gods. Sincere popular worship would surely have led to the eventual growth of a legend such as became usual for later *θεοὶ ἀνθρώπων*. Of this there is no trace for Hellenistic rulers. But there was a legend for Scipio Africanus and for Augustus. Rome's first emperor was seen even by his contemporaries (without hindsight) as a man of destiny who would alter the course of events in the world. Not all the pious predictions of Virgil and Horace were realized, however, and Augustus himself was more level-headed in his attitude. The Flavian dynasty received a good share of adulation. Vespasian treated much of it with proportionate humour. Domitian, on the other hand, took too literally the veneration of Statius and Martial. Bad emperors were clearly megalomaniac. Of good emperors who were worshipped perhaps only Augustus can be said to have attracted anything approaching sincere and serious belief. At all events, the legends in Suetonius speak well for the endurance of popular esteem in his case.

The almost unanimous conclusion of the philosophers who discussed the idea of a divine man (whether he be inspired legislator, statesman or sage) is that such a specimen, if ever he could exist, would be rarissimus. Nevertheless there was no shortage of divine epithets (*θειότατος*, divinus paene vir, etc.) for the philosopher-statesman. Cynics believed that the truly perfect specimens of our humanity who were worthy of divine status (e.g. Heracles, Odysseus, Cyrus) could be imitated only imperfectly by later generations. Even when Stoics postulated a divine spark resident within all men, potential divinity was in the grasp of only a few—for the spark was not easily kindled. In any case the paragons who are cited as truly godlike men are from the past, and it is neither a Stoic nor a Cynic, but a Pythagorean who claims to be and is acclaimed a living example of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

Thus with Apollonius of Tyana the concept of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* leaves the spheres of philosophical speculation and political ruler-cult and returns to the mystico-religious ideas of the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. We can interpret Apollonius only in the light of men like Pythagoras, Empedocles and Socrates. He belongs to that tradition rather than to the philosophical speculation on an ideal and divine sage. And he commands a deeper, more sensitive, and more meaningful adoration than any ruler-god of East or West.

One factor which distinguishes Apollonius from his predecessors is the full legend which had formed in the one hundred years or so between his death and Philostratus's biography. The controversial nature of the evidence reflects once again the extreme complexity of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Side by side with Philostratus's hagiographic portrait there existed a defamatory tradition which depicted Apollonius as a *γῶγς*. The one interpretation may not necessarily be earlier or more trustworthy than the other. Both could have arisen simultaneously out of diametrically opposite feelings which Apollonius will have aroused in different people. Nevertheless the hostile tradition appears to have been dominant before Philostratus (hence no writer before him took Apollonius seriously as a philosopher). And after the rehabilitation was almost complete, the Hierocles-Eusebius controversy set it in motion again. However, the one surviving fragment of Apollonius's writings (apud Euseb. Praep. Ev. 4.13) confirms not Moeragenes but Philostratus. Even some Church apologists praised the philosopher in Apollonius, though all condemned the wonder-worker in him.

In fact Apollonius conformed markedly to the age in which he lived. The negative theme of the Life, that Apollonius was no *γῶγς*, is balanced by the more positively asserted interpretation of his character and deeds as the personification of the perfect (no longer unattainable) wise man. And with the revival of religious Pythagorism and the resurgence of religious sentiment the perfect wise man could as a Pythagorean claim to be a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* after the long-established tradition of the Master. The fact that Apollonius is seen continuously as a superior type of *μάγος* — *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* rather than *γῶγς* — would suggest that there was an indiscriminate host of wonder-workers, good and bad, in the first two centuries A.D. and that Philostratus needed to distinguish Apollonius from the vulgar thaumaturge. The ease with which Philostratus seems to have composed his portrait would also imply that the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* was a clearly perceptible concept in

the minds of men, if not already assigned a fixed literary form.

Lucian knew and parodied this concept in his accounts of certain pietistic individuals whom he considered to be complete frauds. Both he and Philostratus were looking respectively at Peregrinus, Alexander, and Apollonius from divergent viewpoints. Lucian saw most prominently the showmanship in his subjects and this led him to the conclusion that they were shallow tricksters. Philostratus saw only the goodness and the greatness in Apollonius and this prompted him to conclude that he was divine. Who can say whether there was that much dissimilarity in the lives of all three, or whether Philostratus was wrong and Lucian right? A grain of truth should be expected in both interpretations. The controversial and ambiguous nature of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* and of his powers invites at one time the worship and contempt of his fellows in accordance with the disposition of each one.

Lucian's derision of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* in his descriptions of Alexander and Peregrinus prevented any serious use of the category for Demonax whom he greatly admired. But if no divine claims are made for Demonax, the recognition of his superior status is openly admitted and the general feeling given in this dialogue is that Lucian was competent and equipped to "deify" Demonax, had he so desired.

The concept of *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, then, was known and acceptable to some in Lucian's day. It seems also to have cut across the barriers of different cultures. The earlier portraits of Moses by Philo and Josephus will have depended not only on Greek traditions of "men like Pythagoras" but also on certain Rabbinic sources which tended to glorify Jewish folk-heroes. After Philostratus, however, the evidence for the category in literature is more plentiful. The later lives of Pythagoras and the neo-Platonist philosophers owe much in form and shape to Philostratus's transformation of oral and heterogeneous literary traditions on Apollonius into a complete biography.

But Philostratus was not necessarily the first to write a fully comprehensive Life of a divine man in the Graeco-Roman world. Among the early Christian communities a demand for biographical accounts of the first apostles was met by a large quantity of Lives ("acts") which both in form and general content resemble the Life of Apollonius. These second-century documents of the early Church share more specifically with Philostratus's biography the fixation in writing of popular oral traditions on a common type of man. The *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* of the pagan world lived a similar kind of life, performing parallel actions and

following comparable patterns, to the charismatic leaders and propagators of the Christian faith.

Moreover, in the canonical gospels and acts and the apocryphal gospels the characters of Mary, Jesus, Peter and Paul can in many respects be compared legitimately to the Graeco-Roman *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. Often the similarities are vague and on a general level only. And one should show no surprise if both Apollonius and Christ were received by their contemporaries in very much the same sort of way. More specific parallels, however, may not so easily be explained away. It is possible that Philostratus knew of the early Christian literature on Jesus and the apostles and that these influenced his own attitude to parallel events in Apollonius's life; it is also possible that the New Testament writers, being aware of the contemporary concepts and imagery of pagandom, chose to write of their leaders by using some terms and ideas which were also understood by those outside the Christian revelation. At all events, a pagan reader could easily recognize Christ as a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, if nothing more. But the difference in Hebrew literature between an earthly godlike man (*θεῖος ἀνὴρ*) and the godhead living on earth (? *θεὸς ἐπιφανής*) was perhaps too fine a distinction now for the Graeco-Roman mind.

So the ancient world was familiar with the concept of *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* long before its literary transformation in or before Philostratus's lifetime. It may be useful to ask in conclusion how the full literary category as portrayed so powerfully by Philostratus and others after him came into being, and why it did so at that late stage in Graeco-Roman literature.

First, it is possible that the Pythagorean legend was given a full literary treatment by Apollonius himself and in other lost works of early date. But the evidence available cannot demonstrate the nature of any biographical account of Pythagoras before the third century A.D. Apollonius's own *Πυθαγόρου βίος* may well have belonged rather to the same tradition as the so-called Lives of Plato, where biographical detail is subordinate to doctrinal exposition. However, the long-lasting legend of Pythagoras will undoubtedly have contributed to the eventual formation of a literary schema for a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. For we are concerned after all with the writing down of popular oral traditions. A considerable oral legend must be in existence before an attempt can be made at

a literary portrait. The presence of such a legend helped to achieve for Apollonius what its absence failed to achieve for Socrates.

It is this growth of a legend that not only preserves historical personalities in living memory but also, more importantly, transforms or "categorizes" them into a general human type. For example, as soon as an outstanding individual is recognized as saintlike or godlike, the various indications of his superhuman qualities are related. At first specific features which are appropriate only to him are embodied in the accounts. But in popular imagination every single word, action, or mannerism is seen to be full of meaning; and the more removed the oral legend becomes from the lifetime of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, the easier it is for the tradition to acquire supplementary features which, although they belonged properly to the lives of other *θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι*, were almost for that reason expected to be told of every *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*. Gradually, as the concept evolved, a large stock of attributes, actions, wonders and circumstances were available for the construction of a full biography. And the less known about each *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* (and the less written about him in the early stages), the closer the conformity in his legend to the traditional morphology.¹

All parallel features in the lives of various *θεῖοι ἄνθρωποι* cannot, of course, be explained in this way. The common pattern that their lives tend to follow necessitates common characteristics in their legends. A group of clergymen are likely to do and say similar things, but they will differ in many important respects from a group of airline pilots whose lives again would follow a similar pattern. This conformity among the clergymen, however, one would expect to be balanced by a certain degree of individuality. In fact a full-grown legend can totally obscure the marked individuality of a *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*, and the picture transmitted to posterity is very often far removed from what the real human life was like.

Indeed it is a characteristic of the Greek genius to want to reduce human conduct with all its complex ramifications to fixed categories or patterns. The various "types of lives" which were frequently discussed

¹Cf. J. A. Philip, Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism, p. 9; L. Bieler, ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ, ~~WIKIPEDIA~~ I pp. 21ff.

by the philosophers, the *πρακτικός, θεωρητικός, πολιτικός, σχολαστικός, ήσυχος βίος*,¹ may correspond to a similar classification of men into types such as the *βασιλικός, γενναίος, σόφος, ἐσθλός* or *ἀγαθός*, and, of course, *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*.

Now Philostratus was doing no more than placing already established philosophical and popular conceptions within a literary mould. If he was not the first to do this, he was, so far as we know, the most important single contributor to the process of literary transformation for the concept of the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*. It is questionable whether all the credit and initiative was due to the sophist or whether his Life of Apollonius was only part of a more wide-spread literary movement. The fact that he wrote in Greek and not in Latin may be significant. In the second century A.D. rhetorical Greek prose had become a popular medium for romantic, biographical and teratological writings. A love of wonder and a thirst for travellers' tales produced Antonius Diogenes' Marvels beyond Thule, Iambulus's (?) Journey to the Islands of the Sun, and Lucian's splendidly irreverent True Story. There is some reason to suppose that Philostratus, himself caught up in the tastes and tendencies of second-century literature under the Empire, acquired and adapted a well-tried literary style in which the wonderful life of a *θεῖος ἀνὴρ* could be presented. He thus gave a considerable boost to the philosophical and popular religious concepts (not always identical) and provided for later writers a complete scenario for the historical personalities whom they will have assigned to the same order.

A product of the rhetorical prose writings of the second century, the Life of Apollonius of Tyana was not primarily intended to entertain or amaze its readers, though that it may well have done. Its author was attempting to clarify the misunderstanding among his own contemporaries and among earlier generations of a special class of individuals. He will not have foreseen the enormous influence and consequences of his biography. Indeed he himself may have misunderstood the significance and nature of Apollonius's life and work. But along with all others who wrote about *θεῖου ἄνδρες* of one sort or another, he did not fail to recognize the extraordinary dimensions of his subject. Whatever else may be said about the *θεῖος ἀνὴρ*, his singularity is unmistakable.

¹See R. Joly, Le Thème Philosophique des Genres de Vies dans l'Antiquité Classique (Brussels, 1956) and cf. D.L. 7.130; Plato Charm. 160b-c; Resp. 600b; Aristotle Eth. Eud. 1214a 30-65; Eth. Nic. 1.7.

He was not only a nonconformist who said and did things which other men either would not or could not say and do, but he also appeared to live entirely on a more exalted plane in a world of his own. Yet he did not deliberately keep himself apart from other men. On the contrary, he talked to all and sundry and conceived of his life as being devoted to the service of gods and men alike. But ordinary people could not attain his high level of spiritual consciousness, however hard they tried. So they concluded either that they were being duped or that they were in the presence of a divine man. Others in later ages faced with a similar dilemma had to make that choice. Whatever their decision, nothing could convince them that they had not decided aright.

APPENDIX 1

THE COLLECTION OF APOLLONIUS'S LETTERS

In chapter VI it was claimed that the extant collection of Apollonius's Letters would provide corroboration and contrast with the Life of Philostratus. It may prove worthwhile here to indicate the nature and significance of the information which these letters contain.

Where they only confirm what is already known from Philostratus there is little that needs to be said by way of comment. The following list should suffice:

<u>LETTERS</u>	<u>LIFE</u>
1-8, 14-18, 50-52, 79-80.	5.39, 6.13 (Reproof of Euphrates).
9-10	5.40 (Dio).
19	1.23, 24 (Scopelianus).
36, 37, 60	4.26 (Passus).
62	4.31 (Honoured by Spartans).
63-64	4.27 (To Spartan Ephors).
68	4.6 (Prediction of earthquake).
71-72	4.5 (Dislike of Roman names).

Many letters without any specific reference are in general harmony with the narrative of Philostratus. Thus Letters 26 and 27 contain Apollonius's ideas on sacrifices, Letters 35 and 42 speak of his refusal to accept money. His Pythagorean way of life is described in Letters 8, 43, and 52.

Others are not strictly letters at all, but apophthegms in epistolary form. Of these, Letters 79-97 are all preserved by Stobaeus in his Anthology. They are typical of the wise sayings

of any philosopher and may or may not be genuine.¹

The collection also contains additional information on Apollonius so that it complements Philostratus. It is in the letters that the attitude of the people of Tyana to their famous citizen is to be seen.² The town seems at first to have neglected him (Letters 44), but later to have awarded him appropriate honours (Letters 47 end 53). Five letters are addressed to his brother Hestiaeus (44, 45, 55, 72, 73). According to Philostratus, there was only one elder brother (VA 1.13). But in Letters 55 it is perfectly clear that there were three brothers altogether, and this is confirmed by references in other letters (cf. 44, 91). The Apology also speaks of more than one brother (VA 8.7, iii).³

Sardis is mentioned once only by Philostratus as local source for two stories, one of which Apollonius accepted, the other he rejected (VA 6.37). There is, however, no trace of the very prominent tradition in the letters of reproaches from the sage to this town, in which the citizens are utterly condemned for their vices (38-41, 56, 75-76). Similarly the Ionians, Milesians, and Ephesians are in the letters the subjects of fierce criticism (32, 33, 65-67, 68, 71). These were places where Apollonius had spent considerable time, as Philostratus will verify. But he seems not to know of any association with the Trallians (69), the people of Caesarea (11), or of Seleucia (12, 13). Honours received at these places are nevertheless in keeping with Apollonius's reception throughout the Greek world (cf. VA 4.1ff).

There is a marked contrast between the prominence given to the quarrel of Apollonius with Euphrates in the collection of Letters and the few perfunctory references to this in Philostratus.⁴

¹Philostratus quotes Damis as saying that Apollonius set in the epistolary form much of what he said in conversation (1.32). This, of course, could refer to letters of great length containing sermons (δυναλέξεις) rather than to the short and pithy maxims of Stobaeus.

²Philostratus tells us only that Apollonius loved to be called Τυανεύς (7.38)

³See above, p.148 n.3.

⁴See above, p.126. Eighteen of the letters are addressed to Euphrates. He is mentioned only thirteen times in Philostratus (1.13; 2.26; 5.33, 37, 38, 39; 6.7, 13, 28; 7.9; 36; 8.3; 7).

In addition to a quarrel the Letters contain evidence of an attempt on Apollonius's life by supporters of Euphrates (36, 37, 60). One of these henchmen is reproached in VA 4.26 as a parricide, but nothing is said there or elsewhere about the attempted murder at Corinth. Philostratus is concerned not to malign Euphrates but to describe the life of Apollonius for those who were still ignorant of it (VA 5.39). He refers both to the quarrel and to the contents of the letters to Euphrates (VA 4.26; 5.39). But it is apparent that he sought to minimize it. This cannot be out of respect for Euphrates who was undoubtedly held in high esteem by many;¹ for he is prepared to make adverse statements about him on various occasions (e.g. VA 5.38; 6.7; 7. *passim*). It may be that he sought to make the hostilities one-sided so as to display the moral elevation of his hero, who did not condescend to fight insult with further insult.

Information in the Letters which actually contradicts Philostratus is less easy to resolve. For example, in Letters 14 Apollonius asserts categorically that he had never been to Italy, nor been summoned thither, as had Euphrates, and that he would rather have been sent for than go.² This is contrary to the very theme of Books Seven and Eight. For consistency's sake it is necessary to assume that this letter was composed by the sage in his early life. It still makes the first voluntary visit to Rome under Nero a discrepancy, unless of course it is permissible for Apollonius to have changed his mind. In Letters 16 and 17 it is apparent that the title *μύθος* caused Apollonius far less trouble than it caused Philostratus in the Life. The latter would need to reject the sage's statements

¹For the more respectable side to Euphrates see Pliny Ep. 1.10, *obvius et expositus plenusque humanitate*, and in the same letter Pliny's comment, *insectatur vitia, non homines; nec castigat errantes sed enondat*. Cf. Epictetus 4.8, 17. It is, of course, possible that Pliny was deceived. P. Grimal believes that Apollonius was not mistaken about Euphrates' activities as a *nouveau riche* (Letters 2, 3, 6). See his "Deux Figures de la Correspondance de Pline" in Latomus 14 (1955) pp. 370ff.

²Cf. the inconsistency in Apollonius's gracious but resolute refusal to visit Olympia (Letters 24) and his two important visits recorded by Philostratus (4.27ff.: P.15). Again, in Letters 29 he is opposed to festivals, whereas a discourse on the same (8.18) contains no traces of disapproval.

that anyone who was godlike and just could fairly be called a *μάγος* and that a *μάγος* was either a worshipper of the gods or one endowed with a godlike nature.

There is also one major contradiction within the Letters themselves, all of which are of course not necessarily genuine. The Philostratean Apollonius, though quick to rebuke the Greek cities, is essentially a philhellene.¹ In his Letters Apollonius seems to have mixed feelings. Setting aside reproofs of individual cities, there is one letter where he is violently anti-Hellenic.² In other letters he displays a remarkably pro-Hellenic bias, and matches it with antipathy towards the barbarians.³ It is, therefore, more surprising to find in Letters 44 sentiments of universal brotherhood so clearly promulgated. Similarly the Ephesians are praised because their temple is open to all alike, Greeks or barbarians, free men or slaves (Letters 67).

It would be impossible to say in every case whether a letter is authentic or otherwise. The apophthegms, for example, may be genuine sayings of Apollonius which only later took on an epistolary form. With Philostratus the reverse process may have occurred; for the discourse to the Egyptians (VA 6.11) which Apollonius is made to deliver may have been based on an actual speech, or perhaps a letter, which elsewhere is alleged to have been "written" by the sage (VA 3.15). In the collection of Letters some will certainly be genuine. Letters 58, the longest and the most personal, is generally accepted.⁴ Other letters of a private nature are unlikely to have been written by anyone other than Apollonius.⁵

¹Cf. 1.15; 3.31-32, 58; 4.5; 5.25; 6.11.

²For individual reproof see Letters 70 (to the Athenians). For anti-Greek sentiment see Letters 34 (to the wise men in the Museum).

³Letters 8, 11, 71 (pro-Greek) and 8, 20, 61 (anti-barbarian).

⁴Valerius was a governor of Asia. For the date of this letter (A.D. 82) see E. Norden, Agnostos Theos, p. 337; E. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 411f.

⁵The letter from the Babylonian king, Garmus, to the Indian king, Megyndes (59) seems quite out of place. There is no allusion to Apollonius. Its inclusion prompted E. Meyer (op. cit. p. 409) to believe that this collection certainly presupposed the travels to India.

APPENDIX 2

THE AUTHENTICITY OF DAMIS

It may seem easier to disbelieve the forceful arguments against the existence of a genuine diary of Damis, the faithful companion of Apollonius, than to refute them. It will be my purpose here to demonstrate that, however adequate or inadequate that source may have been, its unmistakable reality can be seen from the pages of Philostratus.

First, certain statistics need to be given. The name Damis appears frequently in Philostratus but not always as a source. Often it is Damis the dramatis personae who is mentioned, and the characterization may be largely the work of Philostratus. Only forty-one times in the eight books is Damis actually cited as the source of information.¹ On other occasions the material is introduced by φασι,² λέγεται,³ εὔρον,⁴ οἶμαι,⁵ οἶδα,⁶ ἀκούω,⁷

¹1.3, 19, 20, 24, 32, 33, 34; 2.3, 10, 17, 28; 3.15, 17, 27, 33, 36, 41, 45, 53; 4.19, 25; 5.5, 7, 9, 10, 26; 6.3, 4, 7, 12, 22, 26, 32; 7.15, 21, 28, 35, 38, 42; 8.28.

²2.4, 8, 12, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 42, 43; 3.2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 53, 54, 55, 56; 57, 58; 4.34; 5.2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 14; 6.4, 6, 26, 35.

³E.g. 4.21, 45; cf. 3.1 (λέγουσι); 4.7 (ἔλεγε); 5.3 (λέγονται).

⁴E.g. 1.25; 4.22; 5.39, 40; 8.5, 8.

⁵E.g. 2.19, 25, 42; 4.6, 10; 5.43; 6.24; 8.1; cf. 4.43 (ἠγώμεθα).

⁶E.g. 3.8; 5.2.

⁷E.g. 3.11.

and other corresponding expressions. There are also gaps of considerable size where no citation of Damis occurs, presumably because Philostratus is following entirely different sources.¹ This is particularly true of Book Four, on travels through the Greek cities, where Damis is the alleged source for only two incidents. To blame Damis for each historical inaccuracy in Philostratus, or to use those inaccuracies as a pretext for rejecting the existence of his memoirs really sets too high a value on this document as a source. On the other hand, the opposite danger of undue scepticism is of the two, perhaps, the more readily incurred.

If we accept Meyer's theory, wherever Philostratus cites Damis he is guilty of deception.² But there are passages where he does not merely quote him, but edits, summarizes, or selects from his material. In 1.20 Philostratus says he could wish, for the sake of accuracy and in order to leave out nothing that Damis wrote, to tell of all that was spoken on their journey through foreign lands; but his subject was leading him on to greater and more wonderful things (i.e., the arrival at Babylon). Nevertheless he selects from Damis two topics, namely Apollonius's courage as a globe-trotter and the wisdom that enabled him to learn the language of animals. The episodes which occurred while Apollonius was in Domitian's prison are all recorded by Damis; Philostratus selects only what is relevant (7.28).³ On the other hand, an amusing story which had little to do with Apollonius, about a remote Spanish town, is repeated for its own merit from Damis' account (5.9).

In other places it may be seen that the narrative of Damis was certainly the hotchpotch which Philostratus implied it was (1.19). For instance, the main theme of 1.37 is the quarrel of Vardanes with

¹E.g. 1.4-18, 34-43; 2.11-16 (also 4-9, 26-27), 29-41; 4.1-18, 20-24, 26-47; 5.15-25 (also 12-13), 27-43; 6.13-21 (also 8-11, 23-25), 36-43; 7.1-14 (also 16-20, 22-27, 29-34, 36-37, 39-41); 8.2-27, 30-31.

²See above, p. 155.

³Cf. other examples of selection in 6.10; 5.1. In 3.50 Philostratus begins by giving very few details of the journey home from India. The many animals seen are named without comment: "Talking, as usual, about what they saw, they reached the sea". But fuller information and greater detail follow in 3.53-57, presumably because of the more interesting nature of Damis' log at that point.

the Romans. But the chapter in Philostratus begins with two distinct and quite unrelated interchanges between the king and Apollonius, one on hunting, the other on how best to govern. The same chapter concludes with an entry similarly detached on an illness of the king and Apollonius's "divine" words of comfort to him. Perhaps the quarrel with Rome was written in no greater detail in Damis' journal than the other items, but this was the one which Philostratus chose to expand.¹

A perpetual problem with ancient authors is that it is not always easy to separate plain narrative from annotation. Philostratus too appears sometimes to be making a comment of his own, quite distinct from the narrative, on what he had found in Damis.² In 3.41 he disagrees with Damis, which would be unnecessary if, as Meyer believed, the source was his own invention. The cause of the dissent is a work on astrology by Apollonius which Damis attests. It is obvious from his remarks that Philostratus did not want to believe in its existence, but this is made more difficult for him by the fact that it was mentioned by Damis. He is able, therefore, only to doubt its authenticity. In 3.53 so far from attributing to Damis geographical material which he had found elsewhere, Philostratus openly asserts that the account about the "Red Sea" given by Orthagoras was confirmed by Damis. Similarly in 3.15 he quotes from a homily of Apollonius to the Egyptians the cryptic saying: "I saw Indian Brahmins living on the earth yet not on it, and fortified without fortifications, and having nothing yet possessing everything." This is immediately supported by the less mystical interpretations from Damis.

It is indeed conceivable that in the foregoing passages the sophist had deliberately and carefully arranged the material in order to convince his readers of the reality of Damis and his journal. The following evidence, however, will reveal flaws in his technique which, if he were truly concerned to substantiate the existence of his source, would never have been allowed to pass. There is more than a hint of

¹

For similar small entries without expansion cf. 1.38, and for the expansion of only one among many items cf. 4.24.

²

E.g. 2.18, 25, 43; 3.11; 4.6, 13.

genuineness about Damis' account in a casual remark from Apollonius in 2.11. Talking about the tameness of elephants the sage recalls to Damis the fact that these animals allow their masters to thrust their heads inside their jaws, "as we have seen among the nomads". Now by this remark reference is being made to a personal experience of Damis and Apollonius which Philostratus certainly had not mentioned in any previous chapter. The nomads here are presumably the Arabs of Mesopotamia about whom Philostratus had chosen to relate two details only, namely that Apollonius was brave enough to journey through their country, and that he learnt from them the language of animals (1.20). His selectivity from Damis has caused the omission of a reference in the journal which we should need here.

Another personal experience recorded by Damis which suggests a historical basis for the narrative is given at 6.26, where he finds the noise of the third cataract of the Nile too loud for him to continue further. As a result Apollonius has to report back to him what he saw there. If Damis is fictitious, Philostratus is unnecessarily complicating matters both here and on the numerous other occasions where Damis is excluded from private interviews and Apollonius has to recount to him all that had happened (e.g. 6.32; 7.17-22; 32-35; 8.11-12). In two places (6.32; 7.32-35) it is not even made explicit that Damis found out everything from Apollonius at a later date. This would not worry Philostratus if he were really using Damis' account, but if he had invented Damis one would expect him to be somewhat more meticulous.

Finally, what appears to be well-defined evidence to support the idea that in some places Philostratus quotes Damis and in others he is himself responsible for what is written may be found in the two references to Vindex in Book Five. Damis, who had been excluded from a long and private interview with a governor of Baetica, can only guess what Apollonius and he discussed. But he hazards an opinion that they conspired against Nero, for the last words of the sage were, "Farewell, and remember Vindex" (5.10). Philostratus, not Damis, immediately explains the significance of that remark.¹

¹ 5.10... τί δὲ τοῦτο ἦν; i.e. "Now what did this remark mean?"

Later, however, in a speech to Vespasian Apollonius is made to say that by his help to Vindex in the west he had championed him against Nero (5.35). It is quite probable that Damis was indeed responsible for the earlier conjecture, for Philostratus comments on it by way of an explanation. But Damis would hardly need to guess, if later he was to learn from Apollonius, as Vespasian had learnt, the true nature of the interview. The speech, therefore, seems to be the work of Philostratus and the reference to Vindex lifted out of the earlier item in the journal. It is noteworthy that Damis is not given as a source for any of the chapters concerning Vespasian in Book Five.¹

I am tempted to conclude that many long episodes in Philostratus, like the encounter with Vespasian, were deliberate elaborations by the sophist of rather brief and perhaps ambiguous remarks in Damis. The very basic chapters on Nero and Titus may be compared with the expanded accounts of Domitian and Vespasian. Similarly, for reasons known to the sophist, omissions may have been made from Damis at other places. The sojourn among the Babylonian magi is dismissed in only one chapter (1.26); and yet Apollonius is said to have stayed in Babel for one year and eight months. The encounter with the Egyptian gymnosophists, on the other hand, takes up over half of Book Six. On each occasion Damis was present and his journal, presumably, contained appropriate information. However, to determine further what belonged to Damis and what to Philostratus would be to turn what is, I trust, serious argument into idle speculation.

¹The entire Vespasian-episode may well have originated out of a remark in Damis that Apollonius met or was introduced to the emperor at Alexandria.

APPENDIX 3

A PROBABLE CHRONOLOGY FOR APOLLONIUS

A chronology for the life of Apollonius may be propounded by working back from the one certain date in Philostratus, the vision of Domitian's assassination (8.25-26) on September 18th, A.D. 96. Apollonius had previously spent two years in Greece (8.24), whither he had arrived fresh from his triumph in the emperor's court. This puts the date of the trial to A.D. 93-94.¹ Till then the period of his life since he had quitted India amounted to thirty-eight years (8.7, xi). He must, then, have commenced his travels in Asia Minor (Books Four and Five) in c. A.D. 55-56. (Nero became emperor A.D.54). At the beginning of his Indian journey he stayed for a period of one year and eight months with Vardanes (1.22), whose reign is independently attested c. A.D. 42-44. Thus the round trip took between ten and fifteen years. He was at least twenty-six years of age when he set out (twenty-one in 1.13 and a five-year period of silence followed in 1.14), which would put his date of birth at c. A.D. 14-16. As he died soon after Nerva's accession (8.27-28) he must have lived beyond the age of eighty. This is consistent with the estimates of his life-span in 8.29. He reached the height of his career under Domitian, which accounts for the floruit of Dio Cassius (78, 18), but the Suda is correct in saying that he ἤκμαζεν in the period between Gaius and Nerva: Apollonius will have started his critical Indian journey c. A.D. 40 when Gaius was emperor. It is also possible to accept

.....
¹It is not necessary to understand a reference in 8.15 to the Olympiad year A.D. 93.

Apollonius's own statement that after he returned from India he spent his life chiefly under Nero and his successors down to Domitian (8.7, xi). If ten years or more seem too long for the Indian travels, it is possible that Philostratus was wrong and that Apollonius spent time in the Greek world under Claudius. A letter such as the fifty-third in our collection (from Claudius to the people of Tyane in praise of their distinguished citizen) is by no means impossible, if one considers the keenness of that emperor in respect of provincial affairs.¹

¹Letters 53, of course, may not be the genuine one.

APPENDIX 4

RHETORIC AND OSTENTATION IN PHILOSTRATUS

I References to Legend and Mythology

- 2.3 (Prometheus), 9 (Dionysus), 23 (Heracles and Dionysus).
 3.20 (Ganges), 22 (Palamedes), 25 (Minos and Tantalus).
 4.11-16 (Achilles, Ajax, Orpheus, Palamedes), 34 (Minotaur).
 5.4 (Egyptian Heracles), 5 (Pygmalion, Teucer), 14ff. (Typho),
 23 (Heracles), 26 (Atreides, Ajax).
 5.4 (Memnon), 10 (Heracles), 40 (Anchises, Peleus, Ixion), 43 (Telephus).
 7.7 (Danaiids), 10 (Aharis; Odysseus and Calypso; Heracles and Iolaos),
 24 (Erechthonius), 25 (Alcmaeon), 26 (Kronos, Ares, Hephaestus),
 28 (Odysseus and Polyphemus).
 8.7, ix (Heracles), 7, xvi (Laius etc., Sarpedon, Minos).

II References to Historical Events or Personages

- 1.29 (Themistocles and Artaxerxes), 34 (Cassander, Philip, etc.).
 2.5 (Anaxagoras, Thales), 7 (Archilochus), 21 (Porus, Alexander, Darius).
 3.31 (Xerxes).
 4.21 (Artemisia, Xerxes), 23 (Leonidas, Megistias), 32 (Callicratides, Lycurgus and Iphitus).
 5.7 (Augustus, Julius Caesar, Xerxes).
 6.11 (Plato, Aecchylus), 20 (Lycurgus), 21 (Socrates, Aristides, Solon, Lycurgus).
 7.1-3 (list of philosophers), 37 (Python, Demosthenes).
 8.7, vi (Leonidas, Iphitus, Empedocles, Lycurgus), 7, viii (Democritus, Sophocles, Empedocles), 7, ix (Socrates, Thales, Anaxagoras),
 7, xv (List of soothsayers, Leonidas, Alexander, Cyrus), 16 (Harmodius and Aristogiton), 21 (Gyges and Croesus), 29 (Alcibiades).

III Literary Allusions

- 1.4 (Homer Od.), 13 (Plato, Sophocles), 14 (Homer Od.), 16 (Ovid),
 22 (Homer Il.), 24 (Anth. Palat.), 30 (Demophyle (?), Sappho).

2.9 (historians of Alexander), 13 (Juba), 14 (Euripides), 17 (Nearchus),
32 & 33 (Euripides).
3.6 (Homer Il.), 14 (Homer Od.), 17 (Sophocles), 19 (Homer Il.),
22 (Homer Il.), 27 (Homer Il.), 53 (Nearchus and Orthagoras).
4.11 (Homer Il.), 15 (Homer Od.), 16 (Homer Od.), 20 (Homer Od.),
21 (Aristophanes, Sophocles, Euripides), 25 (Homer Od.), 36 (Plato,
Homer Od.), 38 (Sophocles, Homer Il.).
5.14 & 15 (Aeson, Plato), 26 (Homer Il.).
6.2 (Hesiod), 3 (Euripides), 11 (Stesichorus, Homer Il. and Od.),
31 (Homer Od.), 32 (Homer Od.).
7.4 (Sophocles), 5 (Euripides), 11 (Plato), 12 (Pindar), 14 (Homer Od.,
Euripides, Homer Il.), 22 (Homer Od.), 26 (Phaenias), 30 (Aeson),
31 (Sophocles, Plato), 32 (Homer Il.), 36 (Homer Il.), 37 (Demosthenes),
39 (?).
8.5 (Homer Il.), 7,iv (Homer Il.), 7,xvi (Homer Il. and Od., Sophocles),
13 (Homer Il.).

IV Geographical Information

1.20 (Babylon).
2.1-2 (Caucasus and Taurus), 6 (River Cophen), 10 (Aornus), 18-19 (Indus
and Nile).
3.1 (Hyphasis), 5 (Ganges), 52 (Hyphasis), 53f. (sea-coast).
4.47 (Spain).
5.1-4 (Pillars of Heracles; Gadeira), 6 (Baetica).
6.1 (Nile and Indus), 23-26 (cataracts of Nile).

V Inscriptions

1.24; 2.2, 9, 12, 43; 4.13; 5.5.

VI Architecture and Works of Art

1.19 (image of Io), 25 (tapestries in Babylon).
2.2 & 8 (shrine of Dionysus), 20 (temple reliefs in Taxila), 22 (dialogue
on painting), 23 (houses at Taxila), 24 (temple of sun, images of
Alexander and Porus), 33 (reliefs on shield of Heracles), 42 (gates
and statues of Alexander and of Porus).
3.25 (statue of Tantalus), 14 (statues of Greek gods in India),
48 (sun-god represented by Indian artists), 58 (statue of Aphrodite).
4.7 (Smyrnaean art and architecture), 23 (monument of Leonidas),
28 (statue of Milo).
5.4 (altars at Gadeira), 5 (temple of Heracles, girdle of Teucer).
6.4 (statue of Memnon), 10 (Prodicus's Heracles in art-forms),
11 (list of artists' names), 19 (statue of Olympian Zeus; Phidias and
Praxiteles), 40 (statue of Aphrodite).

VII Music

3.17, 33; 4.21, 24, 39, 42; 5.7, 21; 7.12.

VIII Dreams

1.5, 23-24, 29; 4.34; 8.12, 31.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Only those works mentioned in the footnotes and works which have been of actual assistance in the writing of the thesis are included.

- ADCOCK, F. E. "Caesar's Position in the State", The Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge, 1926-32), vol. 9 ch. 17, 718ff.
- ALTANER, B. Patrologie (Freiburg, 1938).
- ALTMAN, M. "Ruler-cult in Seneca", Classical Philology 33 (1938), 198-204.
- ARMSTRONG, A. H. "Apollonius (of Tyana)", Man Myth and Magic: an Illustrated Encyclopaedia of the Supernatural (in 112 weekly parts, 7 vols. Purnell), I 109f.
- (ed.) The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy (Cambridge, 1967).
- "Was Plotinus a Magician?", Phronesis 1 (1955), 73ff.
- ARNOLD, E. V. Roman Stoicism (Cambridge, 1911).
- BADIAN, E. "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind", Historia 7 (1958), 425-44.
- BAGNANI, G. "Peregrinus Proteus and the Christians", Historia 4 (1955), 107-112.
- BALSDON, J. P. V. D. "The Divinity of Alexander", Historia 1 (1950) 363-68.
- The Emperor Gaius (Oxford, 1934).
- BARRETT, C. K. "The Apostles in and after the New Testament" Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok 21 (1956), 30-49.
- The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London, 1947).
- BAUER, W. Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum (Tübingen, 1934).
- BAUR, F. C. Apollonius von Tyana und Christus, oder das Verhältniss des Pythagoreismus zum Christentum (Leipzig, 1876, repr. Hildesheim, 1966).
- BERNAYS, J. Lukian und die Kyniker (Berlin, 1879).
- BERVE, H. Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage (2 vols. Munich, 1926).

- BERWICK, E. The Life of Apollonius of Tyana Translated from the Greek of Philostratus with Notes and Illustrations (London, 1809).
- BETZ, H. D. Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament (Berlin, 1961).
- BEVAN, E.R. "The Deification of Kings in the Greek Cities", English Historical Review 16 (1901), 625-39.
- "A Note on Antiochus Epiphanes", Journal of Hellenic Studies 48 (1928), 26-30.
- Stoics and Sceptics (Oxford, 1913).
- BIDEZ, J. and CUMONT, F. Les Mages Hellénisés (2 vols. Paris, 1938).
- BIELER, L. ΘΕΙΟΣ 'ΑΝΗΡ, Das Bild des "göttlichen Menschen" in Spätantike und Frühchristentum (2 vols. Vienna, 1935, 1936, repr. in one vol. 1967).
- BIKERMAN, E. Institutions des Seleucides (Paris, 1938).
- BLOCH, H. Conflict between Paganism and Christianity ed. A. Momigliano (n.p., 1963).
- BOLTON, J. D. P. Aristeas of Proconessus (Oxford, 1962).
- BOUSSET, W. Kyrios Christos (Göttingen, 1913).
- BOWERSOCK, G. W. Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire (Oxford, 1969).
- Introduction to the Penguin translation of Philostratus's Life of Apollonius by C. P. Jones (1970).
- BOWRA, C. M. Heroic Poetry (London, 1952).
- BRÉHIER, E. Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philo d'Alexandrie (Paris, 1950).
- BULTMANN, R. The Theology of the New Testament, Eng. Transl. K. Grobel (2 vols. London, 1952).
- BURN, A. R. Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic Empire (London, 1947).
- BURNET, J. Early Greek Philosophy (4th ed. London, 1930).
- Greek Philosophy Part I (no more published): Thales to Plato (London, 1914).
- Platonism (Berkeley, Cal., 1928).
- Plato's Phaedo (Oxford, 1913).
- BURY, J. B. "The Age of Illumination", The Cambridge Ancient History (1926-32) vol. 5 ch. 13, 386ff.
- BUTLER, E. M. The Myth of the Magus (Cambridge, 1948).
- CAMPBELL, F. W. Groves Apollonius of Tyana: a Study of his Life and Times. Introduction by E. Oldmeadow (London, 1908).
- CAMPBELL, J. The Hero with a Thousand Faces (2nd ed. Princeton, 1968).
- CAMPS, W. A. An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid (Oxford, 1969).
- CARY, E. Dio's Roman History, Loeb series, vol. 1 (London, 1914).
- CARY G. The Medieval Alexander, ed. D. J. A. Ross (Cambridge, 1956).
- CARY, M. A History of the Greek World, 323-146 B.C. (London, 1932).

- CASTER, M. Études sur Alexandre ou les faux prophètes (Paris, 1938).
 ----- Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps (Paris, 1937).
- CERFAUX, L. and TONDRIAU, J. Le Culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine (Tournai, 1957).
- CHARLESWORTH, M. P. "Some Observations on Ruler-cult", Harvard Theological Review 28 (1935), 5-44.
- CHROUST, A. H. Socrates, Man and Myth (London, 1957).
- CLOCHE, P. Alexandre le Grand (Neuchatel, 1947).
- COBET, C. G. "Annotationes ad Philostratum", Mnemosyne 8 (1858), 150ff.
- COHEN, H. Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romain communément appelées médailles impériales (Paris, 1859-69).
- CONYBEARE, F. C. Philostratus: The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, Loeb series (London, 1912).
- CULLMANN, O. The Christology of the New Testament, Eng. Transl. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall (London, 1959).
- DAUBE, D. New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1952).
- DAWKINS, R. M. "Ancient Statues in Medieval Constantinople", Folklore 35 no. 3 (1924) 209ff.
- DELATTE, A. La Vie de Pythagore de Diogène Laerce (Brussels, 1922).
- DEMAN, TH. Socrate et Jesus (Paris, 1944).
- DIELS, H. Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, 5th-7th editions with additions by W. Kranz (Berlin, 1934-54).
- DILL, S. Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius (London, 1904, repr. New York, 1957).
- DODDS, E. R. The Greeks and the Irrational (Cambridge, 1951).
 ----- Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety (Cambridge, 1965).
- DUDLEY, D. R. History of Cynicism (London, 1937).
- EHRENBERG, V. Alexander and the Greeks (Oxford, 1938).
 ----- and JONES, A. H. M. Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius (Oxford, 1949).
- ELIADE, M. Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy, Eng. Transl. W. R. Trask (London, 1967).
- FARNELL, L. R. Greek Hero Cults (Oxford, 1921).
- FARQUHARSON, A. S. L. Marcus Aurelius: his Life and his World ed. D. A. Rees (Oxford, 1951).
 ----- The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus (2 vols. Oxford, 1944).
- FERGUSON, J. Socrates: a Source Book (London, 1970).
- FERGUSON, W. S. "The Leading Ideas of the New World", The Cambridge Ancient History (1926-32), vol. 7 ch. 1, 1ff.
- FIELD, G. C. Plato and his Contemporaries (London, 1930).
- FINDLAY, A. F. Byways in Early Christian Literature (Edinburgh, 1923).
- FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J. Josephus and the Jews (London, 1930).

- FDWLER, W. WARDE Roman Ideas of Deity in the Last Century before the Christian Era (London, 1914).
- FRITZ, K. von Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy (Columbia, 1940).
- FULLER, R. H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology (London, 1965).
- GOMPERZ, J. Greek Thinkers (Eng. Transl. L. Magnus and G. G. Berry. (4 vols. London, 1901-12, repr. 1913-29).
- GOODENOUGH, E. R. An Introduction to Philo Judaeus (Yale and Oxford, 1940).
- "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship", Yale Classical Studies 1 (1928), 58ff.
- GRAVES, R. The Greek Myths (2 vols. Penguin Books, 1957).
- GRIFFITH, G. T. ed. Alexander the Great: The Main Problems (Cambridge, 1965).
- GRIMAL, P. "Deux Figures de la Correspondance de Pline: le philosophe Euphratès (et le rheteur Isée)", Latomus 14 (1955) 370ff.
- GRONINGEN, B. A. van, "Apollonius de Tyane", Bulletin de la faculté des lettres de Strasbourg 30 (1951-52), 107ff.
- "General Literary Tendencies in the Second Century A.D.", Mnemosyne 18 (1965) 41ff.
- GROSSO, F. "La vita di Apollonio di Tiana come fonte storica", Acme 7 (1954), 333ff.
- GUTHRIE, W. K. C. The Greeks and their Gods (Cambridge, 1950).
- A History of Greek Philosophy I (The Earlier Presocratics and the Pythagoreans) and II (The Presocratic Tradition from Parmenides to Democritus). Probably 5 vols. (Cambridge, 1962-).
- HABICHT, C. Gottmenschentum und Griechische Städte (Munich, 1956).
- HAHN, F. Christologische Hoheitstitel (Göttingen, 1963).
- HAIGHT, E. H. More Essays on Greek Romances (New York, 1945).
- HALLIDAY, W. R. Folklore Studies, Ancient and Modern (London, 1924).
- HAMILTON, J. R. Plutarch's Alexander: A Commentary (Oxford, 1969).
- HAMMOND, N. G. L. and SCULLARD, H. H. The Oxford Classical Dictionary (2nd ed. Oxford, 1970).
- HAMMOND, M. The Antonine Monarchy (Rome, 1959).
- HARMON, A. M. Lucian, Loeb series, vols. 1-5 (London, 1921-).
- HASTINGS, J. ed. Dictionary of the Bible (4 vols. and Index, Edinburgh, 1898-1904).
- ed. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (13 vols. Edinburgh, 1908-1926).
- HEAD, B. V. Coins of Ancient Sicily (London, 1903).
- Historia Numorum (2nd ed. London, 1911).
- HELM, R. Der Antike Roman (Berlin, 1948).

- HEMPEL, J. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungen von Apollonius von Tyana (Stockholm, 1920).
- HENNECKE, E. and SCHNEEMELCHER, W. ed. The New Testament Apocrypha, Eng. Transl. ed. R. McL. Wilson (2 vols. London, 1962-63).
- HICKS, R. D. Diogenes Laertius, Loeb series, (London, 1925).
- HOISTAD, R. Cynic Hero and Cynic King (Uppsala, 1948).
- HOPE, R. The Book of Diogenes Laertius (New York, 1930).
- HOPFNER, TH. "Apollonius von Tyana und Philostratus", Seminar Kondakov 4 (1931), 135ff.
- JAEGER, W. Paideia. The Ideals of Greek Culture, Eng. Transl. G. Highet (3 vols. Oxford, 1943-45).
- JAMES, M. R. The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford, 1924, 1950).
- Latin Infancy Gospels (n.p., 1927).
- "Apocrypha Anecdota", Texts and Studies V. (Cambridge, 1893).
- JESSEN, J. Apollonius von Tyana und sein Biograph Philostratus (Hamburg, 1885).
- JOLY, R. Le Thème Philosophique des Genres de Vie dans l'Antiquité Classiques (Brussels, 1956).
- KIRK, G. S. and RAVEN, J. E. The Presocratic Philosophers (Cambridge, 1957).
- KNIGHT, W. F. Jackson, Elysion: Ancient Greek and Roman Beliefs concerning Life after Death (London, 1970).
- LABRIOLLE, P. de La Réaction Paienne (Paris, 1948).
- LEGRAND D'AUSSY, P. J. B. Vie d'Apollonius de Tyane (2 vols. Paris, 1807).
- LEISEGANG, H. "Der Gottmensch als Archetypus", Eranos Jahrbuch 18 (1950), 9-45.
- LEO, F. Die Griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litt. Form (Leipzig, 1901).
- LÉVY, I. Recherches sur les sources de la légende de Pythagore (Paris, 1926).
- La légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine (Paris, 1927).
- LIDDELL, H. G. and SCOTT, R. A Greek-English Lexicon 9th ed. revised by H. Stuart Jones. (Oxford, 1925-40).
- LING, T. History of Religion East and West: an Introduction and Interpretation (London, 1968).
- LIVINGSTONE, R. W. ed. The Mission of Greece (Oxford, 1928).
- MACLEOD, M. D. Lucian, Loeb series, vol. 7, (London, 1961).
- MAGALHAES-VILHENA, V. de Le Problème de Socrate (Paris, 1952).
- Socrate et la légende platonicienne (Paris, 1952).
- MEAD, G. R. S. Apollonius of Tyana the Philosopher-Reformer of the First Century A.D. (London, 1901).
- MESK, J. "Die Damisquelle des Philostratus in der Biographie des Apollonius von Tyana", Wiener Studien 61 (1919), 121ff.
- MEULI, K. "Scythica", Hermes 70 (1935), 137ff.
- MEUNIER, M. Apollonius de Tyane ou le séjour d'un dieu parmi les hommes (Paris, 1936).

- MEYER, E. "Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratus", Hermes 52 (1917), 371-424.
- MEYER, R. T. St. Athanasius: Life of St. Antony (London, 1950).
- MILLER, J. "Die Beziehung der vita Apollonii des Philostratus zur Pythagorassage", Philologus 51 (1892), 137-45.
- "Die Damispapiere in Philostratus Apolloniosbiographie", ibidem 66 (1907), 511-25.
- "Zur Frage nach der Persönlichkeit des Apollonius von Tyana", ibidem 51 (1892), 581-84.
- MILLER, W. Xenophon: Cyropaedia, Loeb series (2 vols. London, 1914).
- MINAR, E. L. Early Pythagorean Politics in Practice and Theory (Baltimore, 1942).
- MOMIGLIANO, A. Claudius: the Emperor and his Achievement, Eng. Transl. W. D. Hogarth (Cambridge, 1961).
- MORKHOLM, O. "Studies in the Coinage of Antiochus IV of Syria", Historisk-filosofiske Meddeleeser 40 (Copenhagen, 1962-65), 57-75.
- MORRISON, J. S. "Pythagoras of Samos", Classical Quarterly, n.s. 6 (1956), 135-146.
- "The Origins of Plato's Philosopher-statesmen", Classical Quarterly n.s. 8 (1958), 198-218.
- MUNSCHER, K. "Die Philostrate" Philologus Supplement-band 10 (Leipzig 1907), 469ff.
- MURRAY, G. Five Stages of Greek Religion (Oxford, 1925).
- NAUDÉ, G. Apologie pour tous les grands hommes qui ont été faussement soupçonnez de magie (Paris, 1625).
- NEWMAN, J. "Apollonius Tyaneus - Miracles", Encyclopaedia Metropolitana ed. Smedley E., Rose H.T. and Rose H. J. (29 vols. London, 1845) 10, 619-645.
- NOCK, A. D. "Alexander of Abonuteichos", Classical Quarterly 22 (1928), 160ff.
- Conversion (Oxford, 1933).
- "Notes on Ruler-cult", Journal of Hellenic Studies 48 (1928) 21-43.
- "Studies in the Graeco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire", Journal of Hellenic Studies 45 (1925), 93-94.
- NORDEN, E. Agnostos Theos (Leipzig, 1923).
- Die Geburt des Kindes (Leipzig, 1924).
- OTIS, B. Virgil: a Study in Civilized Poetry (Oxford, 1964).
- PACK, R. "The Volatization of Peregrinus Proteus", American Journal of Philology 67 (1946), 334-45.
- PAULY, A., WISSOWA, G. and KROLL, W. edd. Real-Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft (Stuttgart, 1893-).
- PEARSON, L. The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great (New York, 1960).
- PETRIE, W. M. Flinders Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity (London, 1909).

- PHILIP, J. A. "Pythagoras - The Biographical Tradition", Transactions of the American Philological Association 90 (1959), 185-94.
 ----- Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism (Toronto, 1966).
- PHILLIMORE, J. S. Philostratus: In Honour of Apollonius of Tyana (2 vols. Oxford, 1912).
- PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, A. W. Select Fragments of the Greek Comic Poets (Oxford, 1900).
- POHLENZ, M. Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung (2 vols. Göttingen, 1948-49).
- POSCHL, V. Römischer Staat und Griechisches Staatsdenken bei Cicero (Darmstadt, 1962).
- POWELL, J. U. New Chapters in Greek Literature, Third Series (Oxford, 1933).
- POYSER, G. H. Cicero: De Re Publica (Cambridge, 1948).
- PRIAULX, O. de B. The Indian Journeys of Apollonius of Tyana, etc. (London, 1873).
- PRITCHARD, J. B. ed. Ancient Near Eastern Texts (2nd ed. Princeton, 1955).
- QUASTEN, J. Patrology (Utrecht, 1950-)
- REITZENSTEIN, R. Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen (Leipzig, 1927).
 ----- Hellenistische Wundererzählungen (Leipzig, 1906).
- REVILLE, A. Apollonius of Tyana the Pagan Christ of the Third Century (London, 1866).
- ROBERTSON, J.M. Pagan Christs (London, 1911).
- ROBINSON, C. A. Alexander the Great (New York, 1947).
 ----- "Extraordinary Ideas of Alexander the Great", American Historical Review 62 No. 2 (1957), 329ff.
- ROGERS, A. K. The Socratic Problem (New York, 1933).
- ROHDE, E. Die Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer (3rd ed. Leipzig, 1914).
 ----- Psyche: the Cult of Souls and the Belief in Immortality among the Greeks, Eng. Transl. W. B. Hillis (London, 1925).
 ----- "Die Quellen des Iamblichos in seiner Biographie des Pythagoras", Rheinisches Museum für Philologie 26 (1871), 554-76 and 27 (1872), 23-61.
- ROSTOVTZEFF, M. I. Dura-Europos and its Art (Oxford, 1938).
- SABINE, G. H. and SMITH, S. B. Marcus Tullius Cicero: On the Commonwealth (Columbus, 1929).
- SAVILL, A. Alexander the Great and his Time (London, 1955).
- SCHWARTZ, J. Lucien de Samosate: Philopseudès et De Morte Peregrini (Paris, 1963).

- SCOTT, K. "The Deification of Demetrius Polioketes", American Journal of Philology 49 (1928), 137-66 and 217-39.
- "The Elder and Younger Pliny on Emperor Worship", Transactions of the American Philological Association 63 (1932), 156-65.
- "Emperor Worship in Ovid", Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. 61 (1930) 43-69.
- "Humour at the Expense of Ruler-cult", Classical Philology 27 (1932), 317-28.
- The Imperial Cult under the Flavians (Stuttgart, 1936).
- "Plutarch and the Ruler-cult", Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. 60 (1929), 117-35.
- "Statius's Adulation of Domitian", Am. Journ. Philol. 54 (1933), 247-59.
- "Tiberius's Refusal of the title 'Augustus'", Class. Philol. 27 (1932), 43-50.
- SCRAMUZZA, V. M. "Claudius Soter Evergetes", Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 51 (1940), 261-66.
- The Emperor Claudius (Cambridge, 1940).
- SKEMP, J. B. Plato's Statesman (London, 1952).
- SMITH, L. F. The Genuineness of the Ninth and Third Letters of Isocrates (Lancaster Pa, 1940).
- SOLMSEN, F. "Some Works of Philostratus the Elder", Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. 71 (1940), 556-71.
- STAUFFER, E. Christ and the Caesars (London, 1955).
- STRAUSS, L. Socrates and Aristophanes (London, 1966).
- TAEGER, F. "Zur Vergottung des Menschen im Altertum", Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte 61 (1942), 3-26.
- TARN, W. W. "Alexander: The Conquest of the Far East", The Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge, 1926-32), vol. 6 ch. 13, 398ff.
- Alexander the Great (2 vols. Cambridge, 1948).
- "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind", Proceedings of the British Academy 19 (1933), 123-48.
- and GRIFFITH, G. T. Hellenistic Civilization (3rd ed. London, 1952).
- TAYLOR, A. E. Socrates (London, 1932).
- Varia Socratica I No more published. (Oxford, 1911).
- TAYLOR, L. R. The Divinity of the Roman Emperor (Middletown, 1931).
- "Tiberius's Refusal of Divine Honours", Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. 60 (1929), 87-101.
- "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during his Lifetime", Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. 51 (1920), 116-33.
- TAYLOR, V. The Name of Jesus (London, 1953).
- THACKERY, H. St. J. Josephus, Loeb series, vols. 1-4 (London, 1926-).

- TIDDEMAN, M. F. A Short Life of Apollonius of Tyana Gathered from Many Sources (Adyar, Madras, 1929).
- TONDRIAU, J. "L'avis de Lucien sur la divinisation des humaines", Museum Helveticum 5 (1948), 124-32.
- TOWNEND, G. B. "The Post of Ab Epistulis in the Second Century", Historia 10 (1961), 375-81.
- VOGEL, C. J. de Greek Philosophy (3 vols. Leiden, 1959-63).
- "The Present State of the Socratic Problem", Phronesis 1 (1955), 26-35.
- Pythagoras and Early Pythagoreanism (Assen, 1966).
- WALBANK, F. W. "The Scipionic Legend", Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 193, n.s. 13 (1967), 54-69.
- WEILL, J. Josephus, Budé series, ed. T. Reinach (Paris, 1930).
- WEINREICH, O. Antike Heilungswunder: Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer (Giessen, 1909).
- Studien zur Martial (Stuttgart, 1928).
- WETTER, G. P. Der Sohn Gottes (Göttingen, 1913).
- WHITTAKER, T. Apollonius of Tyana and Other Essays (London, 1906).
- WILCKEN, U. Alexander the Great, Eng. Transl. G. C. Richards (London, 1932).
- WILLIAMS, G. The Third Book of Horace's Odes (Oxford, 1969).
- WOLFSON, H. A. Philo (2 vols. Cambridge, 1948).
- ZELLER, E. Die Philosophie der Griechen (2nd ed. Leipzig, 1868).
- ZIMMERN, A. E. The Greek Commonwealth (Oxford, 1911).

INDEXES

A. INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

Principal sources are not normally included where they simply provide testimonia on the various personalities under discussion.

- Abaris, 15, 30f., 33, 35, 193, 262
 Abraham, 133, 204, 225
 Achilles, 12, 117, 169, 180
 Aelianus, Casperius, 182
 Aelian (of Praeneste), 168
 Aelius Aristides, 208
 Aeneas, 4, 12n., 31
 Aeschylus, 6, 13
 Agesilaus, 83
 Aldus (edition of Philostratus), 199
 Alexander of Abonuteichos, 3, 5, 7, 197, 208, 213-221, 253, 281
 Alexander the Great, 11, 57-66, 67, 71, 82, 171, 173, 180, 207, 227, 258, 278f.
 Ammianus Marcellinus, 133f., 213
 Ammon, 58f., 62
 Amphiaraus, 11f.
 Anaxagoras, 181f., 183
 Andrew, St., 251f.
 Antiochus IV, 72
 Antisthenes, 94 and n.
 Antonius Diogenes, 156, 173, 284
 Antony, St., 206, 237
 Apollo, 15, 30, 35, 40, 216, 261
 Apollonius Paradoxographus, 16
 Apollonius of Tyana, 1, 2n., 3n., 7, 15, 17, 26f., 38 and n., 42, 98, 100ff., 140ff., 212, 216, 221, 223, 226, 235, 239, 247, 253f., 258, 261f., 263, 265-278, 280ff.
 Apuleius, 171, 174
 Archelaus, 159
 Aristeas, 15
 Aristippus, 222
 Aristomenes, 7n.
 Aristotle, 7, 13, 62, 85, 197, 230
 Arnobius, 134
 Artapanus, 226ff.
 Artemidorus, 129, 168
 Arthur, 4
 Asclepiades (of Prusa), 271
 Asclepius, 10f., 19, 72, 87, 102, 116, 159, 195, 209, 216f., 219, 220, 271
 Athenaeus, 168
 Athenodorus, 207
 Augustine, St., 138
 Augustus, 75-79, 82, 89 and n., 166, 263, 279
 Aurelian, 133
 Aurelius, Marcus, 95, 96f., 218
 Bacis, 14
 Bacon, Francis, 200
 Bacon, Roger, 2, 20n.
 Bahais movement, 2
 Beowulf, 4
 Blount, Charles, 200
 Brahmins (Indian sages), 100, 103, 105, 113n., 115, 151, 162-165, 185, 189, 192, 194f., 209, 292
 Brasidas, 68
 Brutus, 87
 Buchan, John, 172
 Buddha (-ists), 1, 2, 164f., 194, 242, 267

- Caesar, C. Julius, 74f.
 Cagliostro, 2
 Camillus, 87
 Caracalla, 82, 130, 133, 139,
 179f., 204
 Casaubon, Meric, 199
 Cassandra, 14
 Castor (and Pollux), 87
 Cato, 92
 Cedrinus, 136
 Celsus, 5, 131, 198, 204, 263n.
 Chariton, 247
 Charlemagne, 4
 Christ, Jesus, In., 2, 133, 134ff.,
 138, 156, 191, 198ff., 239ff.,
 258ff., 282
 Christians (-ity), 82, 210f., 219,
 240, 275
 Chrysanthius (neo-Platonist philosopher),
 236
 Chrysostom, John, 135
 Cicero, 87ff., 95
 Claudius, 79, 89, 296
 Codinus, 136f.
 Commodus, 81
 Constantine, 82
 Crockett, Davy, 4
 Curé of Ars, 2
 Cybele, 165
 Cynics (-ism), 4, 90, 91, 93f., 165,
 208, 210f., 213, 222, 279
 Cyrus (the Elder), 57, 83f., 172, 278f.
- Dalai Lama, 3
 Damis, 103, 119, 124n., 125, 139f.,
 143, 150ff., 153-158, 160f., 163f.,
 170, 185ff., 189, 195, 248, 262,
 272, 290ff.
- Dee, John, 2, 20n.
 Demades, 63, 65, 70n.
 Demetrius (the Cynic), 161, 208, 272
 Demetrius Poliorcetes, 67n., 69f., 71
 Democritus, 91, 181
 Demonax, 94, 166, 207f., 221-225, 281
 Demosthenes, 63f., 65
 Dictys (diary of), 156
 Diocletian, 82, 197
 Dio Cassius, 129f.
 Dio Chrysostom, 90, 94, 128, 166, 170,
 176, 183, 208
 Diogenes (the Cynic), 65, 91, 93f.,
 125, 222
 Diogenes Laertius, 235
 Dion (of Syracuse), 68
 Dionysus, 10f., 60f., 65, 72, 76n., 87,
 162, 180, 209
 Diotogenes, 86f.
- Domitian, 81, 89, 105, 109f.,
 115, 117, 125f., 128f.,
 145ff., 152, 159f., 169,
 176ff., 181f., 189, 192,
 195, 272, 274, 279, 291,
 294ff.
- Ps.- Ecphantus, 87
 Elegabal, 82
 Elijah, 1, 260, 262
 Empedocles, 1, 5, 17-24, 25,
 28, 181, 192, 197, 207,
 209, 217, 235, 253, 273,
 277, 280
 Ennius, 73
 Epicharmus, 13
 Epictetus, 93, 96
 Epicurus, 7, 91, 165, 220f.
 Epimenides, 16, 193
 Euhemerus, 155, 174
 Eunapius, 134, 236
 Euphrates (the philosopher),
 109, 126, 131, 146, 148,
 161, 170, 176, 183, 188,
 190, 192, 287f.
- Euripides, 11, 13, 95
 Eusebius, 137f., 141, 152,
 154, 161, 178, 188f.,
 195, 198ff., 280
- Faust, 2
 Favorinus, 168
 Flamininus, T. Quinctius, 74n.
 Francis, St., 200
 Frepel, l'Abbé, 199
- Gaius (Caligula), 81, 295
 Galba, 107, 111
 Galileo, 20n.
 Gerbert (Silvester II), 2
 Gracchi, the, 74
 Guevara, Che, In.
 Guru Maharaj Ji, 3
 Gymnosophists (Egyptian sages),
 151, 170, 192
- Hadrian, 80, 138, 143
 Haiawatha, 4
 Haranath, 2
 Helvetius, 200
 Heracles, 3f., 9f., 11, 31,
 59ff., 81, 87, 90, 94, 134,
 148, 170, 180, 183f., 209,
 211, 264, 273, 277, 279
 Heraclitus, 28, 93

- Hermotimus, 15, 30, 166
 Herodotus, 13
 Hesiod, 9, 277
 Hiero, 83
 Hierocles, 134, 154, 197ff., 266,
 280
 Hindu (-ism), 1, 267
 Hitler, Adolph, 1n.
 Homer, 6, 9, 247
 Horace, 75n., 77f., 279
 Huetius, Daniel, 200
 Hyperides, 64f.
- Iamblichus, 236
 Iambulus, 284
 Isidorus (of Pelusium), 135
 Isocrates, 62, 86
- Jerome, 138
 Jews, 1, 57, 82, 191, 225ff.
 John, St. (Baptist), 262
 John, St. (Evangelist), 248f.
 Josephus, 128, 206, 225-234
 Julia Domna, 139f., 152, 155ff.,
 179
 Ps.-Justin Martyr, 135f.
- Lactantius, 134
 Leucius, 245ff.
 Levi, Eliphaz, 2
 Lucian, 129, 174, 188, 191, 206ff.,
 247, 254, 284
 Lucius (of Patra), 174
 Lucretius, 23f.
 Lycurgus, 17, 101
 Lysander, 68, 70n.
- Magi (Babylonian), 185ff., 294
 Malalas, 136
 Mao Tse-tung, 1n.
 Marcellus, 73
 Marius, Gaius, 74
 Marius Gratidianus, 74n.
 Mary (The Virgin), 241, 282
 Maximian, 82
 Maximus (of Aegae), 140, 152f., 156
 Maximus (neo-Platonist philo-
 sopher), 236
 Menippus, 31
 Merlin, 1
 Metellus Pius, 74n.
 Milton, John, 242
 Mirandola, Pico della, 199
 Mirza Ali Mohammed, 2
 Mithras, 165
- Moeragenes, 130-132, 142, 149,
 155f., 187, 189, 191, 221, 280
 Mohammed, In., 2
 Moses, 1, 226ff., 244, 260, 264,
 281
 Moslems, 1
 Musonius Rufus, 94, 123, 144
- Nectanebus, 59
 Neo-Platonic Philosophers (in
 Eunapius), 236
 Nero, 81, 82n., 89, 109, 111, 117,
 125f., 144, 159, 161, 176ff.,
 288, 294, 296
 Nerva, 111, 126, 149, 159, 177, 295
 Nicetas, 137
 Nicomachus Flavianus, 133
 Nonnus, 11
- Odysseus, 94, 173, 279
 Olearius, 202
 Olympias, 59
 Origen, 131, 198
 Orpheus, 12, 102, 133, 190, 204, 226
 Otho, 107, 111
 Ovid, 78 and n.
- Paul, St., 239, 245n., 250f.,
 256f., 276, 282
 Peregrinus, 3, 5, 197, 208-213,
 221, 262, 273, 281
 Perseus, 59, 217, 220
 Peter, St., 249f., 255f., 264, 282
 Petronius, 171
 Phalaris, 41f.
 Pharaoh, 59, 71, 75, 226ff.
 Pherecydes, 17, 37f., 277
 Philo, 206, 225-234
 Philostratus, 139ff.
 Photius, 135
 Pindar, 6, 13, 258
 Plato, 7, 13, 84, 92, 95, 102, 125,
 181, 190, 206, 225, 227, 236f.,
 258, 282
 Pliny (the Elder and Younger), 89f.
 Plotinus, 134, 206, 235
 Plutarch, 90n., 128
 Pollux (see Castor)
 Pompey, 74n.
 Porphyry, 236
 Posidonius, 95
 Proclus, 236n.
 Prohaeresius, 236
 Proteus, 120, 129, 187
 Ptolemy (-ies), 67n., 69, 71, 263,
 279

- Pythagoras, 1, 5, 15ff., 17ff.,
 25, 26-44, 57, 101f., 134,
 141, 149, 167, 170, 181,
 190, 191-197, 200, 203, 206,
 215f., 219, 226, 230, 234f., 253,
 258, 261ff., 265f., 273, 277f.,
 280ff.
 Pyrrho, 91
- Ramakrishna, 2
 Rasputin, 3
 Romulus, 12n., 88, 212, 273
 Rutilianus, P. Mummius Sisenna,
 219f.
- Sai Baba, 2
 St.-Germain, Comte de, 2 and n.
 Scipio Africanus, 74, 88, 95,
 134, 279
 Seleucid kings, 71, 72, 279
 Seneca (the Younger), 89, 92f.,
 95f., 128, 208
 Serapis, 165, 179
 Sertorius, 74n.
 Severianus (Governor of Cappadocia),
 218
 Severus, Septimius, 80f., 204
 Severus Alexander, 133, 204
 Sextius, Q., 7
 Sibyl, 14f., 16, 31, 277
 Sidonius Apollinaris, 133
 Siegfried, 4
 Simonides, 6
 Simon Magus, 2n., 249f., 255, 275
 Socrates, 1, 17f., 25, 44-55, 57,
 83f., 91ff., 102, 109, 134, 146,
 167, 169, 181ff., 190, 222, 253,
 278, 280, 283
 Solon, 17, 277
 Sophocles, 6, 13
 Sosipatra (female neo-Platonist),
 236
 Sostratus, 94 and n., 221
 Soterichus, 133
 Sthenidas, 87
 Stoics (-ism), 4, 90, 91ff., 165,
 211, 279
 Suda, the, 140, 295
 Sulla, 74n.
 Swedenborg, 2n.
- Theocritus, 247
 Theophilus, 2
 Theosophists, 2n.
 Theseus, 3, 12
 Thomas, St., 252f.
 Thræsea Poetus, 94
 Tiberius, 79, 159
 Tigellinus, 105, 176ff., 188
 Tillemont, L. de, 199
 Timon (of Athens), 207
 Titus, 80, 90, 111, 119, 176ff.,
 185, 294
 Trajan, 90
 Trophonius, 11f., 150, 181, 192,
 273
 Tzetzes, 130, 136, 154n.
- Vardanes, 105, 159, 161, 175,
 177, 185f., 291, 295
 Vespasian, 80, 89, 101, 105, 109,
 111, 119f., 124, 128, 144, 146,
 159, 170, 176ff., 183, 279, 294
 Vindex, C. Julius, 111 and n.,
 293f.
 Virgil, 77f., 242, 244, 258, 279
 Vitellius, 107, 109, 111
 Voltaire, 200
 Vopiscus, 133
- Xenocrates, 95
 Xenophanes, 28
 Xenophon, 83f., 172, 278
 Xenophon of Ephesus, 247
- Yahweh, 57, 278
- Zalmoxis, 16, 31
 Zeno, 92f., 125, 165
 Zoroaster, 2, 134
- Tacitus, 128
 Tascius Victorianus, 133
 Telesinus, C. Luccius, 116, 160,
 177f.
 Thales, 17, 183, 277

B. INDEX (SELECTED) OF SUBJECTS

- Alchemist, 190
 Aretalogue, 173ff., 246f., 248
 Asceticism, 29, 51f., 122, 124,
 211, 237, 248, 252
 Astral (Soul-) travel, 15ff., 30,
 39, 51, 115, 238
 Authority (of theios anēr), 38, 41
 54, 76, 118ff., 125, 175ff.,
 210, 223, 243, 261

 Bi-location, 15, 33, 114f., 193
 Birth (and Childhood), 40, 59,
 74 and n., 75, 81, 120, 150,
 228, 237, 240ff., 244, 258,
 263, 267

 Catobasis, 11f., 30ff., 245 and n.,
 253, 273
 Caves, 241
 Childhood, see Birth
 Claims (of a theios anēr), 21f., 35,
 63ff., 72, 76, 100ff., 223ff.,
 262, 265
Clouds (of Aristophanes), 29, 46f.,
 53
 Controversy (surrounding a theios
anēr), 3, 20 and n., 39, 44,
 132, 154, 156, 181ff., 199ff.,
 208, 212, 243f., 249, 261

 Daemon, 16, 22, 36, 104, 113, 117,
 120, 188, 211, 224
 Death, foreknowledge of, 80f., 84,
 111, 233, 253, 274
 -----, wonderful, 23, 42, 54, 76, 118,
 121, 150, 212, 236, 238, 248f.
 Disappearance, mysterious, 15ff., 23,
 31, 115, 121, 146, 185, 234
 Dreams (Visions), 51, 80f., 84, 107,
 116, 120, 166, 168, 188, 211, 218,
 236, 249, 251, 256f., 260, 267

 Emperor Worship, 73-82
 Exorcisms, 113f., 236n., 238, 249,
 251f., 255f., 258, 268n.

 Golden Age, 77

 Hero (hero-cult), 3, 4n.,
 67f., 171

 Identification with human
 divinities, 65, 72, 76,
 81f., 104, 134, 216, 220,
 256, 261f.
 Influence, see Authority
 Ithyphallic Hymn, 70

 Kingship, 83-90, 170, 227, 231
 Knowledge, supernatural, 22,
 28f., 51, 76, 106ff., 258

 Long Life, 16, 23, 120f., 150,
 160, 220, 224, 234, 238

 Magic, see Sorcery
 Medicine-man, 3, 14, 19
 Metempsychosis (Re-birth), 15f.,
 22, 30, 108, 162
 Mind Reading, 103
 Miracles, of healing, 19ff., 21
 41, 80, 112ff., 179, 189,
 238, 243f., 249f., 251, 256f.
 ----- wonder-working, 15f., 21,
 33f., 50f., 113ff., 182, 226,
 231f., 235ff., 243f., 248ff.,
 251ff., 259
 ----- predictions, 15ff., 33, 51,
 76, 107, 111ff., 182, 211,
 217ff., 233, 236, 238, 251,
 255, 257f., 264
 ----- with living creatures, 34,
 80f., 108, 238, 243f., 248,
 250ff., 260f.
 Mission, divine, 21f., 35, 46f.,
 49f., 57, 62, 77f., 116, 223
 Mythology, 9ff.

Novel, 170ff., 246f.
Numen (mana), 76, 80f., 112, 117,
 255, 259

 Opposition (to a theios anēr), 10,
 20, 41, 125, 222, 261
 Oracles, 17, 49, 59, 61n., 116,
 211, 216ff., 236f., 242

Proskynēsis, 58, 61ff.
 Providential Protection (of a
theios anēr), 41, 49, 59f., 76
 80f., 82n., 92, 117, 228ff., 233

 Raising of the Dead, 19, 112, 188,
 243, 248ff., 251f., 255, 259,
 270f.
 Recognition (of a theios anēr), 16f.,
 21, 23f., 33, 35, 41, 47f., 59,
 63ff., 69, 72, 74, 79f., 84, 93,
 103ff., 223, 230, 236, 243, 248,
 250ff., 256, 259f., 262, 264
 Rector, 88f.
 Resurrection (and ascension), 212,
 262 and n., 267, 272f., 274
 Revelation, 39f., 106f., 183f., 233, 236
 Ridicule (of a theios anēr), 20, 23,
 29, 31f., 39, 52f., 80, 125f.,
 214ff., 235, 261
 Romance, see Novel
 Ruler-cult, 56, 66 and n., 67f., 70f.,
 73, 87, 207, 231f., 263

 Saints, 2, 237f., 267
 Second Sophistic, 168
 Shaman, 3, 14, 267, 277
 Shepherd, divine, 85, 90n.
 Sorcery (Magic), 20, 38f., 48 and n.,
 115, 126, 131, 135ff., 144, 146,
 156, 181-191, 197, 199, 231, 245,
 249, 251f., 261
 Soul, care of, 52, 121, 230
 Soul-travel, see Astral Travel
 Statecraft, 253, 279, see also Kingship

 Talismans, 135-137, 184
 Telepathy, 109f.

Theios Anēr

----- in legend, 9ff., 28ff.,
 50ff., 127
 ----- in the archaic age, 13ff.
 ----- gradual evolution of, 17
 ----- as literary category, 282ff.

Universal Brotherhood (Unity
 of Mankind), 62, 66

Visions, see Dreams

Wise Man, 91-98, 169, 231f.,
 253